



LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA  
SAN DIEGO

SRLF

PA

4037

5458

1911



A  
000 825 3  
4 2  
9

THE LAY OF DOLON  
(THE TENTH BOOK OF HOMER'S ILIAD)



MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA  
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO  
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.

TORONTO

# THE LAY OF DOLON

(THE TENTH BOOK OF HOMER'S ILIAD)

SOME NOTES ON ITS LANGUAGE  
VERSE AND CONTENTS · WITH  
REMARKS BY THE WAY ON  
THE CANONS AND METHODS OF  
HOMERIC CRITICISM

BY

ALEXANDER SHEWAN

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED  
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON

1911



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

ἡ ταλαιπωρος Δολώνεια !  
κατὰ ταύτης, ἵνα κάγῳ κατὰ τὸν θεῖον εἰπω τῆς  
Παλαιστίνης ψαλμῳδόν, οἱ πάντες, ἀρχαιοὶ τε καὶ νεώτεροι  
“τὴν ῥομφαίαν αὐτῶν ἐστιλβωσαν,  
τὸ τόξον αὐτῶν ἐνέτειναν καὶ ἡτοίμασαν.”  
ἀλλ’ ἔγῳ τολμήσω ἐν τῷ ἀσθενείᾳ μου εἰπεῖν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς.  
VALETTA, ΟΜΗΡΟΥ ΒΙΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΙΗΜΑΤΑ, 364.

θάρσει, μηδέ τι τοι θάνατος καταθύμιος ἔστω.

K 383.



## PREFACE AND INTRODUCTORY

AN author has been known to palliate his boldness in making a book by saying he has written it "to supply a want." The same plea is ventured on behalf of the present work. It may, at first sight, seem difficult to make good such a justification for a contribution to the Homeric Question. The literature of that problem is already of a fullness to defy the bibliographer. And it grows incessantly. Those who try to keep abreast of it in its many branches long for a pause which does not come. There was a brief but welcome lull some years ago. Controversy almost ceased for a time, while disputants fell back and sought to reckon up gain and loss. But the Lachmann drum was beaten afresh ; and the Cretan discoveries, the novelties of the Saga-searchers, the restless strivings of the Culturists, the speculations of Professor Murray and the arguments of Mr. Andrew Lang, have all helped to stimulate discussion. *ἢλθε δ' Ἀμαζών.* Miss Stawell has dealt a heavy blow where it was least expected. The contest is active once more. In Homeric phrase "they battle on relentlessly." An enumeration of only the treatises and essays which have appeared during the four years that the present book has occupied, would require a bulky Appendix.

And yet, abundant as the contributions to the controversy continue to be, and although the Lay of Dolon has certainly its fair share of attention, it may be claimed that the old excuse is a good reason in the case of the present effort. Destructive criticism has scored many supposed successes by determined and exhaustive polemics against particular books or episodes of the poems. Except in rare instances, such attacks have not been

met by replies as careful and detailed. But one thing seems certain, that these demonstrations that there are late parts in the epics are the basis of the whole scheme of disruption. They demand careful examination. We venture to say a word on behalf of a book of the *Iliad* which is believed to be bad and late. The Doloneia cries aloud for defence. There is hardly a textbook of Greek literature or handbook to Homer but regards it with disfavour, tempered only occasionally by a word of tolerant pity or of faint praise. Nearly every work on the Homeric Question, nearly every writer on Homeric matters, contrives somehow to cast discredit on it. Its presence in the *Iliad* beside lays of varying but generally respectable antiquity is to some almost intolerable. Dr. Leaf seems to regard it as dead to criticism and "not worth" expending trouble on. Finsler, in his full review of Homeric literature, hardly deigns to mention it. Miss Stawell, in her delightful work, while she defends successfully two of the other books of the *Iliad* which have been classed as "Odyssean," dismisses its case in a few lines as "simple enough" to dispose of. It is the general attitude; *vox omnibus una*. And further, the Doloneia has been, more than any other part of the *Iliad*, the subject of a number of treatises, devoted to it alone, and all seeking to prove that it is generally bad and altogether ungenuine and late. The newest analysis, in W. Witte's *Studien zu Homer*, is as merciless as any. The Doloneia now lies buried below a cairn heaped up to keep its unclean spirit out of the Homeric world, and every passer by adds a boulder or a pebble. They have even made for him who gave it being this cruel epitaph, *nihil quod tetigit non inquinavit*.

This is a sad state of things to one who has always doubted whether the Doloneia is as bad as it is generally painted, and who is now to argue that it is in every way worthy of a place in the *Iliad*, and as ancient as any other part of that poem. Protests against the condemnation of the lay have been few. Colonel Mure and Mr. Gladstone believed in it, Mr. Andrew Lang has recently spoken out for it, and Mr. Allen certifies that it is

no interloper. But in the half century between Mure's great chapters and *Homer and his Age*, it was but rarely that a voice was raised against the bastardy of the lay. It was forsaken even by Dr. Monro. In legal phrase, decree went by default, and the issue is, or will soon be held to be, *res judicata*. We wish to shew cause for the process known as "a review of judgment." The position taken is generally negative and defensive. We seek to prove that the case against this castaway from the *Iliad* is, for all its bulk, too weak to carry conviction. Truly "there's a big field to ear." But the attempt is well worth making. If the disdain of the Higher Criticism for the Lay of Dolon could be shewn to be unreasonable, we might well say of other parts which have become the butts of critical depreciation, *ετι ελπίδος αλσα.*

The Doloneia is the main theme of this book. But the examination of the literature has taken me further afield, and has led me to consider two beliefs which have gained currency and are almost deemed to be settled beyond dispute. These are the theories that the language of the *Odyssey* is essentially different from that of the *Iliad*, and that there are books of the *Iliad*, especially I, K, Ψ and Ω, which are shewn by their language to be late and Odyssean. Here I have been anticipated in part by Miss Stawell, whose protest against the accepted views will yet, I venture to think, mark a point to be remembered in latter-day criticism of Homer. And lastly, there are the many canons, elaborated in Germany and in much favour in Great Britain and Holland, which are used for its own purposes by the Higher Criticism. Their vitality is phenomenal. They were exposed by Colonel Mure many years ago. They have been denounced by many a writer since. Dr. Carl Rothe shews, with untiring persistence, in his periodical reviews of Homeric literature, how wanting in reason they are. To any one accustomed to the appreciation of evidence they are most questionable principles. But they live and are popular. At every turn their validity as applied to the Doloneia has had to be impugned. Careful enquiry

into its case seems to shew that the lay has been hastily and unfairly judged. And it is with satisfaction that one notes distinct signs that a reaction has at length set in against such methods of arriving at the truth, in their application to the Homeric problem as a whole.

---

The Wolfian attack on the poems was one phase of the mania of the day for proving, in Professor Saintsbury's phrase, "that everybody's work was written by somebody else." It has had, in its various developments, a successful career for over a century. But there is more place now in the controversy for those who plead for "broader views," and summaries of Homeric literature shew that opposition to the disintegrators is making itself heard even in Germany, and with considerable effect. In that country a well-known writer on the epic can commence a Homeric paper by saying, "to-day criticism once more speaks more clearly of Homer as a real individual." Another tells us that the Unitarian view, which not so many years ago was believed to have been laughed out of existence, except in the minds of a few obstinate enthusiasts careless of the results of a century of criticism, is "far from defunct." The reaction against purely destructive analysis cannot be ignored. The number of scholars who refuse to bow the knee to disruption and who have almost been persuaded to a belief in unity, is increasing. In truth some of the newest theories come startlingly near it. But the disruptionists are still active. They cannot forget Wolf. It may be, as M. van Gennep suggests, that their loyalty to the tradition is, to some extent, the effect of "collective suggestion." *ζυγὸς αὐχένι κεῖται.* The case would not be unique in the annals of scientific enquiry.

Chief among the causes which have contributed to this improvement in the prospects of the epics, is the failure of the Higher Criticism to produce any considerable positive results that are generally acceptable. The disagreement among the supporters of the case for disruption is a very remarkable phenomenon.

Essays and treatises which are marvels of acute research, are published only to be severely handled or even refuted out of hand by critics who, on the main question of one or many Homers, are of the same mind as the authors. Mülder speaks of "a centrifugal tendency confusing rather than enlightening. . . . As many beliefs as heads. . . . Every one pipes his own lay about Homer." The enemies of unity have in their time played many parts, and the student of the Question is bewildered by the number and diversity of *Entstehungshypothesen*. πάσας δ' οὐκ ἀν ἐγώ μυθήσομαι. Nor is it necessary to add one more to the enumerations of theories and varieties which are given in Homeric handbooks. One believed some years ago that Lachmann had been disowned for ever. M. M. Croiset declared that his doctrine was dead. But it is true, as has been said, that Lachmannism still prevails under various guises. Robert has even spoken of the "immortal pages" of the great Dissector. But Lachmannism has failed to solve the problem. The Expansionists have equally failed to advance its solution. They have now been seeking after the original nucleus of each poem for 'many years, and have suggested many reconstructions. But surely the friends of unity have reason when they ask why there has not been a definitive delimitation of this *Kern*. If it ever existed as a separate entity, its enucleation could not have baffled the learned labours of more than half a century. And now the old order is changing yet again, and it is denied, for the *Iliad* at least, that there ever was a *Kern*. The Lay of the Wrath is found to have been overrated. It is only *deklassierter Heldensang*, and came, it is said, not first, but last. The Wrath was the *motif* used to make an *Iliad* out of the Trojan lays. And the great hero of the *Troica* must go under with the Wrath. He is not the only victim. The heroes generally have been exalted or degraded, and provided with new fatherlands and new attributes. We have now a Thessalian Agamemnon, a Thessalian Paris, a Laconian Paris, an Arcadian Aeneas, a Boeotian Hector. Aias, who replaces Achilles in the premier place in Trojan legend, and who is the real sacker of

Troy, is not the Aias of the solid flesh whom we know in the *Iliad*, πελώριος, ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν, but a shadowy figure, "son of Shieldstrap," or, as others will have it, *génie du pilier*. He was a homeless *Outis* till Pisistratus gave him to Salamis. All this is the work of a new school, devoted to the study of certain accidents or developments of the saga called saga-displacements (*Sagenverschiebungen*). Their theories have secured some adherents, though Otto Crusius and others have greatly discredited the method of investigation. It is characterised by a weakness for appreciating indications in history and legend, even in *Märchen*, at more than their true evidential value, and by the all-weakening assumption that certain parts of the poems have been condemned beyond hope of appeal as late. It seems to mark retrogression towards a very old and almost forgotten stage of Homeric enquiry. It will not be a long step from shieldstrap and doorpost to sun-myth and allegory. Achilles will be the mountain torrent once more, Helen the light of day, and Troy and the *Troica* the water, water everywhere of Forchhammer's famous hydrographical manual.

It is not surprising that there is increasing aversion to the methods of Dissection and the infinite variety of the results it offers for acceptance. And this attitude of dissatisfaction has been stiffened by the positive progress which has been made in several spheres of Homeric and prehistoric research. The props of the Wolfian position have all been shorn away. The part assigned to Pisistratus in many forms of destructive theory is now accepted by only a very small minority of scholars. The revelations in Crete have annihilated other fundamentals. The archaeologist has come to the assistance of the Homerist, and "the science of the spade" has, in Dussaud's words, "upset all received ideas."<sup>1</sup> Wolf's *repente ex tenebris* is now seen to have been a splendid misdescription. Thirty years ago it seemed to Professor Mahaffy and others, that epics "artistically perfect"

<sup>1</sup> Schliemann inaugurated a period of discoveries deren Ende unabsehbar, deren

Ergebnisse unschätzbar sind (Wilamowitz, *Über die ionische Wanderung*, 2).

could never have “come out of the dark age of a people without written records,” and that a “Committee Homer” was “nothing in comparison with the single unlettered bard of popular fancy.” It was, as Dr. Monro cautiously described it, an *argumentum ad ignorantiam*. Now, it is clear that the germs of the heroic poetry which afterwards matured in the Homeric epics, may well have produced their first bloom in the conditions which Aegean explorers have brought to light. Great poetry is one of the natural *ἀναθήματα* of such a civilisation. There is a parallel in our own history. The conditions which are said to have generated and fostered the literature of the Elizabethan era, are known to have existed in Minoan Crete. The island was peopled by a race whose artistic genius *some* influence stimulated to an activity which is a marvel to scholars. In a few years the old-time discussions as to the *σήματα λινγρά*, the existence of a reading public and the possibility of memorial composition and transmission, have become obsolete. Mere academic discussion on such points has been superseded. “An inch of potsherd,” or a representation of a shield or lyre, may cancel the results of learned speculation. In the last decade the “triumph of the spade over the pen” has been celebrated in many a learned essay.

Tradition has been rehabilitated. In regard to Greek origins, Mr. Hogarth declares that it has been “signally vindicated.” Other authorities tell us that “sober fact corroborates fables.” The stories of the Early Age of Greece are no longer scorned as only folk-tales, or the record of “a past that never was present.” The legends that made the old island kingdom the *incunabula* of Hellas, and that told of her former supremacy in Aegean waters, are accepted as historical truth. Père Lagrange says confidently that “Minos re-enters history”; Professor Ridgeway has fixed his *floruit*; Mr. Lang has vindicated his Homeric character against interested post-Achaean scandal of a very low order. And the civilisation which has been named from the old king who walked with Zeus, flourished in the regions where the Homeric poems know it or a civilisation

closely akin to and derived from it. Crete was in intimate relations with Egypt, as the *Odyssey* suggests, and with Sicily, in very ancient times. The suspicions formerly cast on passages in the poems that mention these countries seem very futile now.<sup>1</sup> Every year furnishes more ground for saying of the archaeologist, as was said long ago, though with much less truth, of a textual critic, that he is giving us back our Homer.

M. Bérard has rescued the Homeric Geography from the Wonderland to which *les géographes de cabinet* had banished it, and has resolved some crucial difficulties,—the drive from Pylos to Sparta, the position of Pharos, the puzzles of the Pointed Isles and Nestor's Iardanos. Mr. Allen's study of the *Catalogue* and the Great Appellatives, and Mr. Myres' of the Homeric references to the Pelasgians, shew that the conditions recorded are real and ancient. When the epics are approached without prejudice, and not with the conviction that they are conglomerates of many ages, consistency and evidence of unity are generally to be found. Dr. Dörpfeld's exploration of Ithaca and her ἀντιπέραια may yet help to establish the ancient date of Homer. The same expert's monumental *Troja und Ilion* may not have said the last word as to the city of Troy; but as to the great War itself, we have the conviction of the authorities that it has a basis of fact, whether in the struggles of settlers or in an expedition to destroy a rival dominating a great trade-route. That colonial enterprises should attract so much saga is perhaps less likely. But Mycenae may well have been the seat of such a suzerainty as the *Iliad* implies, and one of Brückner's contributions to Dörpfeld's great work makes it probable that the destroyers of the "Sixth Burg" were the Achaeans of Homer. Light comes in, though in feeble rays, from many points. There is ground for hoping that the causes of the attack on Troy will yet be ascertained more fully, and that it will not pass the wit of scholars to separate, in Professor

<sup>1</sup> But they die hard. They have been put to a new and similar use since the above was written. Fick, in his

latest Homeric essay, *Die Entstehung der Odyssee*, 186 f., restates the Sicilian references for the benefit of Cynaethus.

Inama's words, "the little kernel of historical truth from the thick envelope of legend." Nothing in the current literature of the subject is more striking than the respect accorded to the Homeric record by the best of the archaeologists, unless it be the freedom with which the believers in four centuries of poets talk of and quote a "Homer," unified *ad hoc*, in support of their own theories.

There is agreement as to the reality of the "Homeric Age," meaning by that expression the life and times which are mirrored in the poems. As to its unity there are still differences. But attempts to define "culture-layers" have not been successful; Cauer thinks they cannot succeed. Robert's effort, unsurpassed among Homeric treatises for acuteness of interpretation and boldness of method, was received with coolness. Mr. Andrew Lang's demonstration of "one moment of culture," in a period of transition and perhaps of disturbance, was so strong that but little has been urged in reply. A doubtful line in the *Odyssey*<sup>1</sup> has been used against it, and also the cremation difficulty by those who do not accept Dörpfeld's solution. The general silence in face of such a body of proof seems ominous for the divided cause of multiple authorship. A relevant question is whether the supposed contributors to the poems were unique among primitive composers all the world over in this, that they were keen but clumsy patrons of the art of archaising. This has become an *idée fixe*. But enquiries based on it demand, more than any, the continual acquiescence of the reader in the view that passages in the poems are the products of a late, degenerate, imitative age. When that is granted, various culture-elements can be detected, though they are admitted to be "intertwined and blended" to a degree which makes one wonder that experts should ever essay to separate them, or hope to do so with any degree of success. Reference may be made to the statement, in the introductory chapter of Mülder's work on the *Sources of the Iliad*, of the manifold forms which archaising may have

<sup>1</sup> I have ventured to propose an emendation of this line in App. M

assumed. Critics have no small freedom of choice, and a wide range in time from Mycenae to historic Asia Minor. That Ionia had a free hand to manipulate the epics and to introduce her own heroes and her own civilisation, is an assumption second only, for purposes of Dissection, to the postulated Pisistratean *Ordner*, and one that is not likely to stand long.

The age which produced the Homeric poetry was not an unlettered age, not the early period in the life of a people in which the *Volksgeist* expresses itself only in ballads made and sung by every hearth, or by wandering bards "for good cheer." No one now denies that the poems are far removed from primitive effort. They are not even "popular epic," except in the sense in which all epics may be so designated; the folk probably never wanted a connected poetical saga. The *dichtende Volksseele* seldom rises above the lay. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are "artistic epic"; they are "the creations of a mature art." It has been said that "every poet has his pedigree." We may say the same of the two great epics.<sup>1</sup> There is general agreement that they appeared at the end and as the fruit of a long period of development. That does not prove that they were each or both together the work of one individual; it does make such an explanation of their origin easier of acceptance. And surely the disappearance of all vestiges of the poetry that preceded them must tend to compel the same belief. It is difficult to understand what influence it was, if not reverence for supreme genius, that decreed that all other early efforts should be forgotten, *ignota longa nocte*, and that the two great epics should alone survive, with a definite ascription as the work of one man. All the ideas current, till a few decades since, of the state of Greece before what was then deemed the dawn of its history, have been changed. Its civilised existence has been extended by centuries. The Homeric poems may have made for themselves their unique place in Greek life long before the days of Solon. Nothing forbids us to believe that the name of Homer had, in

<sup>1</sup> In Penelope's words, τ 163, οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ δρυός εἰσι παλαιφάτου οὐδὲ ἀπὸ πέτρης.

those early days, the reality, the individuality and the reverence which attach to it when we first hear it, and which in the ancient world it never lost. Had the original sceptics of the eighteenth century possessed the knowledge of the Early Age of Greece which the learned of the present day have acquired, there would perhaps have been no Homeric Question. Must they not have continued to accept the existence of Homērus as readily as the personality of Arctinus or Stasinus?

The position of the Cyclices in Greek literature is now well ascertained, and the better it has been appreciated the more it has told in favour of the antiquity and the unique position of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Careful examination of their remains has proved that they knew and respected the two great epics, the themes of which were, in Hennings' words, "consecrated ground which the Muses no longer permitted man to tread." These later epic poets might imitate Homer, but they sedulously refrained from trespassing on his domain. It is as if the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* had already secured canonical position. Cyclic work is, in universal estimation, of a lower grade, and reflects an inferior order of things, a poorer life, one might almost say, in a later age of degraded ideals. Yet even late, discredited parts of the epics (which are supposed to have been at that period in an inchoate state, greedily receptive of new matter and tenacious of it when acquired) are free from the debased practices and beliefs which are found in the compositions of the Cyclic writers. It seems to be a difficulty in the way of accepting an evolution of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in the course of several centuries down to the sixth, that they should have remained through the Cyclic age in a condition which invited unlimited patching, expansion and manipulation, and this in spite of the fact that they were objects of national care and reverence; while another set of epic productions, of a lower type and never regarded with great respect, came down to posterity intact as the undisputed productions of definite individuals.

The study of the epics of other countries and of national poems, not generally genuine epics, has made great way since Lachmann, inspired by the Wolfian model, failed first with the *Nibelungenlied* and then with the *Iliad*. In the works of Heusler, Ker, Drerup and many others, we see a better way from *Lied* to *Epos*. Signor Comparetti's essay on the *Kalewala* is a classic on the origin of national poems, and remains irrefragable. There are such poems, and there are traditional books, which have been made by one form or another of "material synthesis," but no instances of finished epics, incomparable in plan, dramatic treatment, nobility and grace, that have had such an origin. Saga may collect in cycles, or be attracted and massed *autour d'un noyau primitif*, but it never, left to itself and the bards, acquired artistic form. "Wherever there is poetry there is a poet." For an *Iliad* or an *Odyssey* the genius of the poet is needed, to select, to blend, to transform and re-create. That, with the evidence which the poems themselves present of transcendent creative power, is the great argument for the existence of Homer. The unvouched, unreal agencies with which Dissectors have traffic,—a Flick-Poet, a Compiler, a *Redactor*, a Commission, the *Dichterseele* of the folk, or even the Spirit of Greece working in mysterious fashion through ages, could not create great unities like the epics of Troy. They have produced, in Comparetti's phrase, only "unruly agglomerations" like the *Mahābhārata*, or a compilation like the *Kalewala*, which shews us "the natural condition of poetry before it becomes individual and artistic,"—before in fact the *ποιητής* appears, when the day of the *ἀοιδός* begins to wane. How can we seriously regard the popular theories, when we find eminent students of early poetry, as Professor Ker, taking as models of epic excellence two growths which are said to have been the sport of time, and to have taken final shape from a haphazard and persistent process of patchwork? Or when we hear the Professor of Poetry at Oxford declare, in words which many of the enemies of unity themselves accept, that "the consent of all competent judges from the earliest recorded time to our own has

placed them at the very head of all poetry"? It is difficult, with Professor Murray, to regard it as "much the most likely thing," or even *a* likely thing, that the *Iliad*, one of these "artistically perfect" poems that stand at the very head of all poetry, is a traditional book which "grew as its people grew," and the work of generations of poets all endowed with the matchless "intensity of imagination that makes the *Iliad* alive." That an *Iliad* or an *Odyssey* should have been formed in such a way is to many not merely improbable, but even unthinkable. To Mure it seemed repugnant to reason, as to experience. Professor Burrows protests that the inability of other nations to produce great epics, is not to be put down to their "sinful tendency to work by evolution,"—which seems to be an inversion of the argument to make it stand the less steadily and fall the more easily. "Unity can no more bring forward an analogy than evolution can." But every great epic, as the work of a great poet, is an analogy. That evolution did not end in a Homer elsewhere was the misfortune of the nations, not their fault. Saga is universal, but poets of the very highest stamp are few and far between.

The manipulation of the poems by the Higher Criticism has been characterised by excesses which have at length brought the inevitable reaction in favour of more sober procedure. The practice of mutilating them by the excision of whatever proved inconvenient to the views of the individual operator has produced vigorous protests, and not from the Unitarian side alone. *kai κεραμεὺς κεραμεῖ κοτέει*. It is strange that it has been tolerated so long, when one observes how easily the results of the best professional excisers are rendered of no effect by later workers. The text is now better protected against arbitrary changes. Modernisation during centuries of transmission is as acceptable an explanation of irregularities as the late interpolator or *Bearbeiter*. Discredited parts of the poems claim the same treatment as those which have found favour in the eyes of Dissectors. The abuse of the Homeric Repetitions was declared a few years ago, by one

of the ablest of the analysers of the *Iliad*, to be among the worst weaknesses of the Higher Criticism. Only those familiar with the Homeric literature of Germany are in a position to appreciate that rebuke to the full. The *Unebenheiten* disclosed by a hostile, microscopic criticism such as poetry has perhaps never in the world's history been subjected to, are beginning to be rated at their true value. Those who are satisfied with Dr. Monro and others that the Great Discrepancies do not exist, can afford to be indifferent to the smaller irregularities on which Dissecting Criticism has waxed so bold. In all these departments of learned Homeric investigation, sounder methods are being opposed to the old uncritical and almost vindictive ways. Cauer's *Grundfragen* and Mülder's *Quellen* are notable protests against many small popular devices.

On the philological side "the decline of the destructive fashion" has attracted notice, and is no less instructive. Many are the tests; none has proved illuminant. The Digamma, which "o'ertops them all," has given no results that Dissectors can contemplate with satisfaction. Meillet has recently declared that the poems belong to a stage of Ionic in which *F* was not yet defunct. Such a pronouncement by such an authority may comfort the upholders of the antiquity of the two epics. The market for other "linguistic peculiarities" is also depressed. The *ἄπαξ εἰρημένα*, the Article, the Prepositions, the Optatives, the Genitives and the Datives have all grown as sulky and irresponsible as the Digamma. The precise nature of the language of the poems, and whether these are to be regarded as Achaean or Ionian, are questions still with the experts, though they seem to be on the way to solution. And whether the belief which is gaining ground, that that language was Achaean speech, what Dr. Monro termed the *vulgare illustre* of the poets of the day, and not an artificial "medley" created by generations of singers, be correct or not, there are many high authorities who are satisfied that the language of the poems is essentially one throughout. Fick's Aeolic theory has not prevailed against them. *ἄν* and *ἐσ*

and the Iteratives have proved to be but blank cartridges. Miss Stawell has sounded the knell of the theory of Odysseanism in the *Iliad*, and has cut away the main ground for the belief that the epics were composed in different ages. The Neo-Homerists who are transferring the *Mēnis* from the earliest to near the latest place in the *Iliad*, are undoing at one stroke, to the great satisfaction of Unitarians, much of the philological case which has been elaborated by generations of critics against other parts of that poem.

At every step forward the way seems clearer. There is fresh confirmation of unity and reality, and increasing dissatisfaction with the methods which have been popular. Their insufficiency has been exposed, and they are no longer backed by Pisistratus, schools of singers careless of their great heritage, barbarism in early Greece, unreality of the narrative, geography and culture of the poems, and other beliefs of the kind. While successive theories fail and are superseded, the difficulties in the way of the Unitarian belief are disappearing. It is long since a great and judicious authority expressed the opinion that a solution of the problem could never be more than hypothetical. In regard to solutions based on Dissection, that dictum is perhaps incontrovertible. But much water has in the meantime flowed under the Homeric bridges. If, when another half century has passed, it be still possible to frame hypotheses that are new, another Friedländer may be able to say that there is no room for them. The *prima facie* case which governs the burden of proof may be too strong. The plea of the adversary has been that it does not lie on him to disprove what was the unanimous belief of learned antiquity, because there never was such a belief. He urged, and continues to urge, that other poems were ascribed to the author of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* which are now known not to be his. This is one of many positions which Dissecting discussion has always assumed to be inexpugnable. Yet only a careful examination of the passages in Greek literature which were supposed to support it, was necessary for its disproof. Volkmann and Hiller and Rothe have proved that there never

was any general attribution of the lesser "Homeric" compositions to "Homer." The evidence crumbled at their touch, and "Homer" as a "collective name" was shewn to be a "fantasy." Mr. Allen has supplemented their proof by an examination of the references to the *Homeridae*, ending with an "inference from the Sons to the Father." The onus remains on the disintegrators. The case for the old traditional belief in unity meantime gathers strength with every year.

The basis of the case against it is, as we have said, the assumption that certain parts of the poems have been proved to be late. It is an assumption that detracts from the value of Dissecting treatises, not merely in the eyes of Unitarians,—that is a small matter,—but also to such other critics of their own way of thinking as cannot accept the particular delimitation of late and early. It spoils the argument in every other section of any such treatise. Incipient conviction vanishes as passages in the poems which bar conclusions are waved aside as of late origin. When others, though allowed to be early, are nevertheless known to have been late in securing a place in the epos, such a faculty for divination staggers us. Passages in the *Iliad* which obstruct a theory may be rejected *en bloc* because they have been suspected, while passages in the *Odyssey* that favour it are allowed to stand, although it is easy to find authorities who condemn them also. The decisions, the *obiter dicta*, or even the bare suspicions of critics in the ancient or the modern world are always available. Or something is detected which can be characterised as unusual, peculiar or difficult, or which occurs elsewhere in the poems, or which does not occur elsewhere, and the enquirer thereupon chalks up "late" and passes on, often without any attempt to justify the inference. Hostile suggestion is assimilated without hesitation. That other ancient and even modern masterpieces can be broken up by the same drastic treatment, is a consideration which is not heeded. No hope seems to lie that way. So far it has proved but a fruitless vexing of the poet's mind. It was Blass, one of the foremost

scholars of his day, who exclaimed to the Homeric critics of his country, "you Germans are strange people," and who asked, if the *Odyssey* were a *Flickpoem*, what term of reproach was to be reserved for *Faust*. He could believe as readily in the Lernaean Hydra as in a "many-headed Homer."

The conformity of the contents of the poems to the individual critic's views as to late and early is often established with much learning, skill and patience, and with great effect on the reader. But it has to be borne in mind that any such enquirer has in the poems an unparalleled wealth of material of the greatest variety, which can be utilised for application or deduction in many ways. Mülder closes the discussion on archaising in the first chapter of his new work on the *Iliad* with the pregnant sentence, "it is beyond doubt that, in the way the *Iliad* is treated, everything without exception can be perverted to its opposite." And there are also at the critic's disposal the copious results achieved by a long line of predecessors, to draw on in any case in which reasoning requires to be fortified or speculation to be rendered plausible. It is not difficult, with such means at command, to bring the *Realien* into agreement with preconceived notions as to the different dates of strata and books and passages. Yet how easily any such laboriously demonstrated harmony can be disturbed, is well known to those who peruse the reviews of treatises of this kind. Their schemes have a foundation of shifting sand.

The position is a strange one. On the one side, Unitarians have piled up arguments so strong for homogeneity that they are all but ignored by the opposition. When Dissectors condescend to notice their work, it is generally either to express surprise at the continued existence of their creed,—to Wilamowitz, for instance, it is a *Wahn* or delusion,—or to observe that they "are not to argue with." Mure has never been answered. His book has not, in the words of Professor Mahaffy, an authority who can see something in his opponents' case, "received a tithe of the attention it deserves." It is not, I think, even mentioned in the

*Handbook of Homeric Study* written a few years ago by Father Browne. It is easy to say that it is out of date; but the reasoning in it is of the kind that is not staled by age. Similarly the recognition accorded to the labours of Dr. Rothe, one of the greatest of living Homerists, is anything but adequate. Finsler's *Homer*, a work notable among recent comprehensive reviews of Homeric literature, does mention two of his separate treatises, but passes over in silence the careful periodical reports on the Homeric Question which he has made during the past thirty years, though they teem with argument and are specially distinguished by the clearness with which the issues are stated and discussed. Cauer's work (*Grundfragen*<sup>2</sup>) is one of the few known to me that shew intimate acquaintance with them. There is the same disinclination to meet the proofs adduced by other Unitarians. On the other side, a great multitude that no man can number of analysers and Dissectors, with something more than the *cor Zenodoti*, stick faithfully to the old way, greatly encouraged by the failure of their opponents to meet them on their own ground. They have provided themselves with a stock-in-trade which, for wealth of expedient at least, should be a model to destructive criticism for all time to come. We shall venture to give an estimate of it in detail when we have completed our examination of the case against the Doloneia, which will afford us many a glimpse into the *Werkstatt* of the Dissecting operator.

It is disheartening to think that discussion must continue on such lines. One could wish that some scholar of weight and leading would plead for a meeting of experts, after the manner of other learned Conferences. Such a Round Table meeting might at least settle the little that is common to the opposing forces, expunge for ever from the record a number of settled but baseless beliefs, arrive at a concordat on some points in dispute and define the many on which debate must proceed. It might also have the effect of inducing scholars to inform themselves better as to the Homeric literature of other countries. It is

disappointing to find Dr. Monro's work, especially his splendid résumé of the Question in his edition of the second half of the *Odyssey*, so seldom referred to in German treatises. But the neglect is more than repaid by the ignorance of, or indifference to, Rothe's contributions to the controversy that prevails in this country. *Veniat felicior aetas!*

---

It was originally intended to confine this work to an examination of the philological attack on the Doloneia. But it was often difficult to weigh objections to the diction without reference to collateral matters of the *Unebenheit* kind which are rocks of offence to the critics. The whole of the opposition thus came under survey, and chapters have been devoted to the position of the lay in the *Iliad*, its affinities with other books of that poem, its alleged Odyssean complexion, and a large bunch of special difficulties which have brought no small gain to its adversaries. A Bibliography has been added. It is roughly compiled, but it may serve as a basis for a better and more complete survey of the literature, and be of assistance to any one who takes up the subject hereafter.

The contents of the book are mostly spade-work of a humble description. There is not much in it that pretends to be new; even its mistakes are not original, unless I have failed to follow authority as closely as I have tried to do. Nearly every page is concerned with points on which the great ones of the world of Homeric enquiry are at daggers drawn. It was not for me to express opinions on such matters of contention. In the rare cases in which I have done so, it has been done with the greatest diffidence, in matters philological especially. I have searched Homeric treatises for enlightenment on every point. And the greatest of these are the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. They are, as has often been said, their own best interpreters. For the rest, I make one comprehensive confession of my indebtedness. But I must, in great gratitude to their authors, make an

exception in regard to a number of indispensable works which, with the standard editions of the text, have always been at my side,—the *Homeric Grammar*, the *Enchiridium*, brightest of handbooks, the Concordances, Ebeling's and Seiler's Lexicons, Gehring's *Index*, Schmidt's *Parallel-Lexikon* and Mendes da Costa's *Index Etymologicus*. There is perhaps more to be won with the help of the mechanical aids than many think. I must also specially name those great store-houses of the criticism of the poems, the Ameis-Hentze editions. And finally, greatest help of all, Dr. Rothe's reports already referred to. As a record of the progress of the Homeric Question, and of the opinions on every point in it of a scholar whose knowledge of the problem is unsurpassed, and whose fairness and freedom from *esprit de coterie* are conspicuous, these papers are indispensable and invaluable. Unfortunately the magazine in which they appear is little known in this country. That they are so seldom referred to is greatly to be deplored. I venture to express the hope that they may all be yet collected and republished by their learned author with a summary of the discussions of the past thirty years.<sup>1</sup>

I use the term "Dissectors" for convenience' sake, to indicate those writers who represent the disintegrating side of Homeric criticism, that is, all who argue multiple authorship and who seek to assign different parts or strata of the poems to different ages. "Homer" is used as the equivalent of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; "Homeric" describes what is found or can be paralleled in either or both poems. I have followed no system in the transliteration of proper names, as no plan that has ever appeared seems to be free from objection.

And so I leave the book, but with no apology for its heresy, which must justify itself as it can, to the judgment of the modern *Homeridae*. It may be that the gulfs of the Higher Criticism will wash it down, and that it will never touch the Happy

<sup>1</sup> Since the above was written, Dr. Rothe's *Die Ilias als Dichtung* has appeared,—too late, I very much regret, for me to make use of it for this book.

"Isles of critical approval. So be it, if it fails to furnish good cause for its author's belief that the learned are sadly astray in their estimate of the Doloneia. But if it shall only be the means of inducing some one more competent to enter the lists, and especially if some little part of what is contained in it shall prove to be of use in a renewed and better effort, its writer will have good cause to feel satisfied.

A. SHEWAN.

ST. ANDREWS,  
*November, 1910.*



## CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE AND INTRODUCTORY . . . . .	vii
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	xxxiii
ABBREVIATIONS USED . . . . .	xxxvii
CHAPTER I	
THE STORY OF THE DOLONEIA . . . . .	1
CHAPTER II	
SOME OPINIONS ON THE DOLONEIA . . . . .	11
CHAPTER III,	
INTERPOLATION . . . . .	17
CHAPTER IV	
EMENDATION . . . . .	24
CHAPTER V	
THE LINGUISTIC ATTACK . . . . .	27
CHAPTER VI	
THE <i>ILIAD</i> AND THE <i>ODYSSEY</i> —ALLEGED DIFFERENCE OF LANGUAGE . . . . .	35
CHAPTER VII	
ON LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES . . . . .	48
	xxix

CHAPTER VIII		
LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES OF K—THE HEAD AND FRONT		PAGE 61
CHAPTER IX		
THE PREPOSITIONS . . . . .		72
CHAPTER X		
THE ARTICLE . . . . .		77
CHAPTER XI		
THE PSEUDO-ARCHAISMS . . . . .		90
CHAPTER XII		
THE DIGAMMA . . . . .		97
CHAPTER XIII		
THE VERSIFICATION . . . . .		106
CHAPTER XIV		
THE PARALLEL PASSAGES . . . . .		115
CHAPTER XV		
THE ALLEGED ODYSSEAN CHARACTER OF I, K, Ψ, Ω . . . . .		126
CHAPTER XVI		
POSITION OF K IN THE <i>ILIAS</i> —ΦΑΣΙ ΔΕ ΟΙ ΠΑΛΑΙΟΙ . . . . .		133
CHAPTER XVII		
POSITION OF K IN THE <i>ILIAS</i> —MODERN VIEW . . . . .		140
CHAPTER XVIII		
THE DOCTORING OF I . . . . .		147

## CHAPTER XIX

DRAMATIS PERSONAE	PAGE 150
-------------------	-------------

## CHAPTER XX

ODYSSEUS	162
----------	-----

## CHAPTER XXI

MINOR AFFINITIES	171
------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XXII

SOME DIFFICULTIES	178
-------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XXIII

ARMOUR AND DRESS	189
------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XXIV

IS THE DOLONEIA A BURLESQUE?	199
------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XXV

HOW IS IT WITH THE <i>MENIS</i> ?	205
-----------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER XXVI

CONCLUSION	214
------------	-----

## APPENDICES

A. THE INTERPOLATIONS IN K	221
----------------------------	-----

B. K 465-8	229
------------	-----

C. EMENDATIONS	232
----------------	-----

D. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE GRAMMAR OF THE <i>ILIAS</i> AND THAT OF THE <i>ODYSSEY</i>	238
--	-----

E. DIFFERENCES IN THE VOCABULARIES OF THE <i>ILIAS</i> AND THE <i>ODYSSEY</i>	246
--	-----

	PAGE
F. ITERATIVE VERBS, AN AND EΣ . . . . .	253
G. LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES OF K . . . . .	257
H. ODYSSEAN DICTION IN K . . . . .	264
I. ILIADIC DICTION IN K . . . . .	268
J. LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES IN A . . . . .	270
K. ODYSSEAN DICTION IN A . . . . .	272
L. DID ODYSSEUS AND DIOMEDE RIDE OR DRIVE? . . . . .	274
M. αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος . . . . .	279

## INDEX

1. GENERAL . . . . .	281
2. GREEK . . . . .	287
3. SOME PASSAGES DISCUSSED . . . . .	289

## A PROVISIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE DOLONEIA

- ABBOTT, E. Introduction to Purves' The Iliad of Homer translated into English Prose, xxix. f.
- ADAM, C. Das Plastische im Homer, 1869, 8, 140 f.
- AMEIS-HENTZE. Iliad, Anhang zu K, Einleitung.
- ARNDT, C. F. L. De Il. poëmatis compositione, 1838, 14 f.
- BÄUMLEIN, G. F. L. In Philologus, xi. 425 f., and Zeitschr. f. d. Altertumswiss. 1848, Nr. 43.
- BECHTEL, F. Die Vocalcontraction bei Homer, 1908, 3 f.
- BELOCH, J. Griech. Geschichte, 1893, i. 135 f.
- BERGER, J. De Il. et Od. partibus recentioribus, 1908, 90 ff.
- BERGK, T. Hist. Gr. Lit. 1872, i. 597 ff.
- BERNHARDY, G. Hist. Gr. Lit.<sup>3</sup> 1877, pt. ii. 137, 139, 163 f.
- BETHE, E. Homer u. die Helden sage, 1902, 4.
- BLACKIE, J. S. Homer and the Iliad, 1866, i. 257 f.
- BLAKENEY, E. H. The Iliad of Homer translated into English Prose, vol. i. 275.
- BLASS, F. Die Interpolationen in d. Od. 1904, 8.
- BOUGOT, A. Étude sur l'Il. d'Homère, 1888, 195 ff., 462 ff.
- BRANDT, K. Zur Gesch. u. Komposition d. Il. in N. Jahrb. f. Philol. 1888, 101 f. Review by Rothe, Jb. 1888, 355 ff.
- BROWNE, H. Handbook of Homeric Study, 1905, 110, 113.
- CAMMANN, E. L. Vorschule z. d. Il. 1829, 49.
- CAUER, P. Grundfragen d. Homerkritik,<sup>2</sup> 1909, 133, 268, 441.
- CHRIST, W. Hist. Gr. Lit.<sup>4</sup> 1905, 46; Hom. oder Homeriden,<sup>2</sup> 1885, 57, 68, 100; Die Wiederholungen, etc., 1880, and Die Interpol., etc., 1879; Zur Chronologie d. altgriech. Epos, 1884, 50, 60; and his Iliad, 1884, 32 f., 74, 83, 95.
- CLERKE, A. M. Familiar Studies in Homer, 1892, 96 ff.
- CORDERY, J. G. The Iliad of Homer,<sup>2</sup> 1887, i. 482.
- CROISET, M. Hist. Gr. Lit. 1887, i. 139.
- CURTIUS, G. Andeutgn. üb. d. gegenwärt. Stand d. homn. Frage, 1854, 27, 42, 47.
- DELLA SETA, A. In Rendic. d. re. Accadem. d. Lincei, 1907, xvi. 153, 162, 183 f., 201 f.
- DRERUP, E. Homer, 1903, 5, 9, 109.

- DUGAS-MONTBEL. Hist. d. Poésies Homériques, 1831, 68.
- DÜNTZER, H. Hom. Abhandlgn. 1872, 303 ff., 470 ff.
- ELLENDT, J. E. Drei hom. Abhandlgn. 1864, 38, 43, 56.
- ENGEL, F. J. Zum Rechte d. Schutzflehdenden bei Hom. 1899, 28;
- Ethnograph. z. homn. Kriegs- u. Schützlingsrecht, i. 1904, 25, iii. 1906, 10 n., 16, 24.
- ERHARDT, L. Entstg. d. homn. Gedichte, 1894, 156 ff., 509.
- EYSENHARDT, F. Die hom. Dichtung, 1875, 21 f.
- FICK, A. Ilias, 1886, 383, 388 f., 463 ff.
- FINSLER, G. Homer, 1908, 518, 601.
- FORCHHAMMER, P. W. Erklärung d. Il. auf Grund, etc., 1888, 115 ff.
- FRANKE, C. De nominum propr. epithetis Homericis, 1887, 17, 51 f.
- FRIEDLÄNDER, L. Die hom. Kritik von Wolf bis Grote, 1853, 37, 68, 84.
- FRIES, C. Griech.-Oriental. Untersuchgn., I. Homerische Beitr., B. Mythologische Zusammenhänge, 1904, 235 ff.
- GEDDES, W. D. Problem of the Hom. Poems, 1878, 28, 41.
- GEMOLL, A. In Hermes, xv. 557 ff., and xviii. 34, 81, 308 ff.
- GENZ. Zur Ilias, 1870, 33.
- GEPPERT, C. E. Ursprung d. homn. Gesänge, 1840, pt. i. 42, 74, 280 f., 411, 430.
- GISEKE, B. Hom. Forschgn. 1864, 217 ff., 251.
- GLADSTONE, W. E. Studs. in Hom. and the Homc. Age, 1858, iii. 389 ff.
- GOLDSCHMIDT, M. Gentagelserne i de Homeriske Digte, 1900, 13, 36, 94, 99, 200, 215, 218, 220, 224 f.
- GRIMM, H. Ilias, zehnter bis letzter Gesang, 1895, 12-61; in Deutsche Rundschau, 1892, 69 ff.
- GROTE, G. Hist. of Greece, chap. xxi. edn. of 1888, 119 f.
- GRUPPE, O. Griech. Mythologie u. Religionsgeschichte, 1906, i. 676 n.
- HARDER, C. Homer, 1904, 234.
- HEINZE, R. Virgils epische Technik,<sup>2</sup> 1908, 215 ff., 446 ff.
- HENKE, O. Iliad, 1896-7, Hilfsbuch, 13.
- HENRY, R. M. In C.R. xx. 192 ff., with criticism by Mr. Andrew Lang, 432 ff., and rejoinder, xxi. 97 ff.
- HIECKE. Der gegenwärt. Stand der homn. Frage, 1856, 25.
- HOFFMANN, C. A. J. Quaestiones Hom. ii. 1848, 124 ff., 219, 254 f.
- HOFMANN, P. Aristarchs Studien "de cultu et victu heroum," 1905, 52 f., 56 ff.
- HOLM, A. Ad C. Lachmanni exemplar de aliquot Il. carminum compos. 1853, 10.
- JACOB, A. Entstg. d. Il. u. Od. 1856, 236 ff.
- JÄGER, O. Hom. Aphorismen in Pro Domo, 1894, 228; Homer u. Horaz im Gymnasialunterricht, 1905, 82.
- JAHR, P. De Il. libro decimo, 1889.
- JEBB, R. Homer, 1886, 123, 137, 156.
- JEVONS, F. B. Hist. Gr. Lit.<sup>2</sup> 1889, 505, 508.
- JORDAN, H. Der Erzählungsstil in d. Kampfscenen d. Il. 1905, 60 ff.
- KAMMER, E. Einheit d. Od. 1873, 36 ff.; Ästhetischer Kommentar z. Homers Il.<sup>2</sup> 1901, 215 ff.
- KAYSER, K. L. Hom. Abhandlgn. 1881, 8, 75 ff., 85.

- KIENE, A. Komposn. d. Il. d. Hom. 1864; Epen d. Hom. pt. ii. 90 ff.
- KLUGE, H. Entstehungsgesch. d. Il. 1889, 153, 162; Vorhomeriche Kampfschilderungen in d. Il. in N. Jahrb. f. Philol. 1893, 86, 90 f.
- KNÖTEL, A. J. R. Homeros d. Blinde von Chios, Pt. ii. 1895, 150 ff.
- KOCKS. Einheit in d. Komposn. d. Il. in Gymnasium, 1890, 55.
- KOPPEN, J. H. J. Erklärende Anmkgn. z. Homers Il. 1792-1823, iii. 190 ff.
- KORNKE. Eingang d. neunten Gesanges d. Il. 1896, 13 f.
- KUHLBARS. Cur lib. Il. decim. e contextu carm. Homerici emovendus sit, 1876.
- LACHMANN, K. Betrachtgn. üb. Hom. Il.<sup>3</sup> 1874, section xiv.; Fernere Betrachtgn. 1841, 26 f.
- LANG, A. Homer and the Epic, 1893, 145 ff.; Hom. and his Age, 1906, 12 f., 124, 173 ff., 258 ff. And see Henry.
- LAWSON, J. C. Edn. of Iliad, I and K, 1902.
- LEAF, W. Iliad,<sup>2</sup> 1900; Companion to the Il. 1892, 38, 189 ff.
- LEHMANN, C. Quaest. Homcae. 1875, 20.
- LEHRS. Aristarchus,<sup>3</sup> 1882, 440.
- LUDWICH, A. Aristarchus, 1884-5, i. 9 ff., ii. 394 ff.; Verhältnis d. peistr. Redaction, 1903, i. 3, 7; Rhapsodien d. Il. A-Σ, 1899, 8; Die vermeintl. Notwendgkt, ein Epos Οὖτος Ἰλίου, etc., 1902, 12; Die hom. Frage u. ihre Beantwortg. 1904, 3, 5, 9, 11.
- MACINAI, L. Omero, L' Iliade, Canto i. 1894, xxiii. f.
- MAHAFFY, J. P. Hist. Gr. Lit.<sup>3</sup> 1891, 56, 81, 83.
- MENRAD, J. De Contractionis et Synizeseos usu Hom. 1886, 50, 76, 159.
- MEYER, E. H. Achilleis, 1887, 373; Hom. u. d. Il. 1887, 134 ff.
- MISTRIOTES, G. ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ ΤΩΝ ΟΜΗΡΙΚΩΝ ΕΠΩΝ, 1867, 276 f., 313 f.
- MONRO, D. B. Iliad,<sup>4</sup> 1894; Odyssey ν-ω, 291, 328, 367 n., 371, 378; Homc. Grammar,<sup>2</sup> 1891, see Index under "Iliad, characteristics of particular books."
- MÜLDER, D. Hom. u. d. altionische Elegie, 1906, 20; Die Ilias u. ihre Quellen, 1910, Index, K.
- MÜLLER, H. D. Histor.-mytholog. Untersuchgn. 1892, 71, 94, 131.
- MÜLLER, K. O. Hist. Gr. Lit., Eng. Transln. by G. C. Lewis, 1847, 53.
- MÜLLER, W. Hom. Vorschule,<sup>2</sup> 1836, 97, 114 f.
- MURE, W. Hist. Gr. Lit. 1850, i. 264 ff., ii. 176.
- MURRAY, G. Rise of the Greek Epic, 1907, 145, 165 and n., 189; Hist. Gr. Lit. 1907, 20.
- NABER, S. A. Quaest. Homcae. 1877, 170 f., 216 ff.
- NIESE, B. Entwicklg. d. homn. Poesie, 1882, 24 f., 64.
- NITSCHE, A. Über d. Echtheit d. Doloneia, 1877.
- NITZSCH, G. W. Sagenpoesie d. Griechen, 1852, 128, 196, 223 ff.; Beitr. z. Gesch. d. epischen Poesie d. Griechen, 1862, 53, 378 f., 408.
- NUTZHORN, F. Entstehungsweise d. homn. Gedichte, 1869, 223 n.
- ORSZULIK, K. Verhältnis d. Doloneia z. d. übrig. Theilen d. Il. u. z. Od. 1883.
- OSTERN, H. Über d. Bewaffnung in Homers Il. 1909, 16 f., 28 f., 73 f., 79.
- PALEY, F. A. Iliad, 1866-71.
- PEPPMÜLLER, R. Commentar d. xxiv. Buches d. Il. xxvii. f., and in Jahrb. f. klass. Philol. 1894, 345 ff.

- PERRIN, B. Equestrianism in the Doloneia, in *Transns. of the American Philolog. Assocn.* vol. xvi. 1885.
- PIECHOWSKI, J. *De Ironia Iliadis*, 1856, 100 ff.
- PLÜSS, T. In *Jahrb. f. klass. Philol.* 1888, 185 ff.
- RANKE, F. *Die Doloneia*, 1881.
- REICHEL, W. *Hom. Waffen*,<sup>2</sup> 1901. See Index locorum.
- RIBBECK, W. *Hom. Miscellen*. ii. 1888, 23 n.
- RITSCHL, F. *Die Alexandrin. Bibliotheken u. d. Sammlung d. homn. Gedichte*, 1838, 62 f.
- ROBERT, C. *Stud. z. Il.* 1901, 501 ff., 574.
- RÖMER, A. *Hom. Gestalten u. Gestaltgn.* 1901, 17.
- ROTHE, C. *Jb. Bursian*, 1882, 321 ff., 1883, 131 ff., and 1885, 211; *Jb.* 1887, 332, 1889, 355, 1891, 284, and 1909, 227
- SCHMID, C. *Homerische Studien*, 1905-8, i. 10, 11, ii. 19 f., 39-41, iii. 17 f.
- SCHNEIDER, F. *Ursprung d. homn. Gedichte*, 1873, 26 f.
- SCHÖMANN, G. F. *De reticentia Homeri*, 1854, 15 f.
- SCHULTZ, J. *Zur Ilias-Kritik*, 1900, 18; *Das Lied vom Zorn Achills*, 1901, 30.
- SCHULZE, W. *Quaest. Epicae*, Index locorum, K.
- SCOTT, J. A. In *Classical Philology*, 1910, 41 ff.
- SEYMOUR, T. D. *Life in the Homc. Age*, 1907, 10, 652 f., etc.
- SICKEL, K. F. *Quaest. Homericarum*, pt. i. 1854.
- SITTL, K. *Wiederhlg. i. d. Od.* 1882, 7 ff., 30 ff., 68 f.; *Hist. Gr. Lit.* 1884, pt. i. 92 f.
- SORTAIS, G. *Ilios et Iliade*, 1892, 71 ff.
- STAWELL, F. M. *Hom. and the Il.* 1909, 21, and in App. C.
- STIER, G. *Iliad*, 1886-1900.
- TERRET, V. *Homère*, 1899, 229 ff.
- VALETON, M. *De thorace apud Homerum*, in *Mnemos.* 1904, 105 ff., and Index locorum.
- VALETTA, J. N. *OMHPOY BIOΣ KAI ΠΟΙΗΜΑΤΑ*, 1867, 364 f.
- VAN HERWERDEN, H. *Quaest. Homcae*. 130 f.; *Adnott. ad. Il.* 34 f.
- VAN LEEUWEN, J. *Enchiridium dictionis Epicae*, 1892-4, xxx., xxxvi.
- VOLKMANN, R. *Commentat. Epicae*, 1854, 120; *Gesch. u. Kritik d. Wolf'schen Prolegg*. 1874, 114, 142, 228 and n.
- WECKLEIN, N. *Stud. z. Il.* 1905, 34 and n., 42, 55, 58.
- WEIDEMANN, F. *De ira Achillis*, 1889, 3.
- WEISSENBORN, E. *Achilleis u. Ilias*, 1890, 19.
- WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORF, U. *Hom. Untersuchgn.* 1884, 231, 238, 413.
- WILKINS, G. *Growth of the Homc. Poems*, 1885, 89 f., 123.
- WITTE, K. *Singular und Plural*, 1907, 88, 116.
- WITTE, W. *Stud. z. Hom.* 1908, 1 ff.
- WOLF, H. *Homs. Il. erläutert und gewürdigt*, 1905, 40 f.

## ABBREVIATIONS USED

In some instances a work which is quoted several times is referred to by the author's name alone. In such cases the name of the work is given opposite that of the author in the subjoined list.

References to pages of this book have always the addition *infra* or *supra*.

References to works are in every case to pages, unless it is otherwise stated.

- Aeol.* (Hinrichs). De Homericæ elocutionis vestigiis Aeolicis.  
*Ästh. Komm.* (Kammer). Ästhetischer Kommentar zu Homers Ilias.<sup>2</sup>  
*Agar.* Homericæ.  
*Altion.* (Mülder). Homer u. d. altjoniche Elegie.  
*Am.-H.* The Ameis-Hentze editions of the Iliad and Odyssey.  
*Andeutgn.* (G. Curtius). Andeutungen üb. d. gegenwärtigen Stand d. homn. Frage.  
*Anmkgn.* (Cauer). Anmerkungen zur Odyssee.  
*Anmkgn.* (Nägelsbach). Anmerkungen zur Ilias (A, B 1-483, Γ).<sup>3</sup>  
*Anthrop. and Class.* Anthropology and the Classics.  
*Ar.* Aristarchus.  
*Ar. (Lehrs).* De Aristarchi studiis Homericis.<sup>3</sup>  
*Ar. (Ludwich).* Aristarchs homerische Textkritik.  
*Beitr.* (Nitzsch). Beiträge zur Geschichte d. epischen Poesie d. Griechen.  
*Beitr.* (Studniczka). Beiträge zur Geschichte d. altgriechischen Tracht.  
*Bergk.* Griechische Literaturgeschichte, vol. i.  
*Bernhardy.* Grundriss d. griechischen Litteratur, Pt. ii.  
*Bewaffg.* (Ostern). Die Bewaffnung in Homers Ilias.  
*Bougot.* Étude sur l'Iliade d'Homère.  
*B. ph. Wocht.* Berliner philologische Wochenschrift.  
*Bréal.* Pour mieux connaître Homère.  
*Comment.* (Peppmüller). Commentar d. XXIVsten Buches d. Ilias.  
*Commentat.* (Bäumlein). Commentatio de compositione Iliadis et Odysseae.  
*Comm. Ep.* (Volkmann). Commentationes Epicae.  
*Compan.* (Leaf). Companion to the Iliad.  
*C.P.* Classical Philology.  
*Croiset.* Histoire de la Littérature Grecque, vol. i.  
*D.H.A.* (Ellendt). Drei homerische Abhandlungen.  
*Discovs.* (Burrows). The Discoveries in Crete.  
*Dress* (Abrahams). Greek Dress.  
*Düntzer.* Homerische Abhandlungen.  
*E.A.G.* (Ridgeway). The Early Age of Greece.

- Ebel.* Ebeling's Homeric Lexicon.
- Einheit* (Kammer). Die Einheit d. Odyssee.
- Ench.* van Leeuwen's Enchiridium dictionis Epicae.
- Entstg.* (Erhardt). Die Entstehung der homn. Gedichte.
- Entstg.* (Giseke). Die allmähliche Entstehung d. Gesänge d. Ilias
- Entstg.* (Jacob). Die Entstehung d. Ilias u. d. Odyssee.
- Entstg.* (Kluge). Entstehungsweise d. Ilias.
- Entstg.* (Nutzhorn). Entstehungsweise d. homn. Gedichte.
- Erzählgsst.* (Jordan). Erzählungsstil in d. Kampfscenen d. Ilias.
- Finsler.* Homer.
- Gesch. u. Krit.* (Volkmann). Geschichte u. Kritik d. Wolf'schen Prolegomena.
- Grdfrgn.* (Cauer). Grundfragen d. Homerkritik.<sup>2</sup>
- Grimm.* Homer, Ilias, zehnster bis letzter Gesang.
- Grote.* History of Greece, edition of 1888.
- H.A.* Homerische Abhandlungen.
- H. and A.* (Lang). Homer and his Age.
- Handbook* (Browne). Handbook of Homeric Study.
- Handbuch* (L. Meyer). Handbuch d. griechischen Etymologie.
- H. and E.* (Lang). Homer and the Epic.
- H. and Il.* (Stawell). Homer and the Iliad.
- Hayman.* Edition of the Odyssey.
- Heinze.* Virgils epische Technik.<sup>2</sup>
- Helbig.* Das hom. Epos aus den Denkmälern erläutert.<sup>2</sup>
- H.G.* Monro's Homeric Grammar.<sup>2</sup>
- Hist. Gr.* History of Greece.
- H.G.L.* History of Greek Literature.
- Hom. Aph.* (Jäger). Homerische Aphorismen in Pro Domo.
- Hom. Krit.* (Friedländer). Die hom. Kritik von Wolf bis Grote.
- Hom. Krit.* (Ilg.). Die hom. Kritik seit A. Wolf.
- Hom. od. Homdn.* (Christ). Homer oder Homeriden.<sup>2</sup>
- Hom. u. Hor.* (Jäger). Homer und Horaz.
- H. U.* Homerische Untersuchungen.
- Ideal* (Blume). Das Ideal d. Helden u. d. Weibes bei Homer.
- Il. lib. oct.* (Calebow). De Iliadis libro octavo, 1870.
- Interpol.* (Blass). Die Interpolationen in d. Odyssee.
- Interpol.* (Christ). Die Interpolationen bei Homer.
- Iterat.* (Lentz). De versibus apud Homerum perperam iteratis.
- Jahr.* De Iliadis libro decimo.
- Jahrb. k. A.* Jahrbücher f. d. klassische Altertum, etc.
- Jahrb. k. P.* Jahrbücher f. klassische Philologie.
- Jb.* Jahresberichte d. philologische Vereins in the Zeitschrift f. d. Gymnasialwesen.
- Jb. Bursian.* Bursian-Müller's Jahresberichte über d. Fortschritte d. Altertumswissenschaft.
- Jebb.* Homer.
- Jevons.* History of Greek Literature.<sup>2</sup>
- Jiriczek.* Northern Hero Legends, English Translation in the Temple Primers.
- Ker.* Epic and Romance, edition of 1908.

- Kuhlbars.* Cur liber Iliadis decimus e contextu carminis Homerici emovendus sit.
- Kühner-Blass* and *Kühner-Gerth.* Kühner's Ausführliche Grammatik, edited by Blass (Pt. i.) and Gerth (Pt. ii.).
- L. and V.* (Seymour). Homeric Language and Verse.
- Lawson.* Edition of I and K.
- Lawton.* Art and Humanity in Homer.
- Leaf.* Edition of the Iliad.<sup>2</sup>
- Life* (Seymour). Life in the Homeric Age.
- Mahaffy.* History of Classical Greek Literature.<sup>3</sup>
- M. and R.* Merry and Riddell's edition of Odyssey I.-XII.
- M. and T.* Goodwin's Moods and Tenses.
- M.C. (Cobet).* Miscellanea Critica.
- Menrad.* De Contractionis et Synizeseos usu Homerico.
- Milton* (Masson). The Poetical Works of John Milton.
- M.S.L.* Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris.
- Mure.* Critical History of the Language and Literature of Antient Greece.
- Murray.* Rise of the Greek Epic.
- Naber.* Quaestiones Homericæ.
- Nachträge* (Volkmann). Nachträge zur Geschichte und Kritik der Wolf'schen Prolegomena.
- Nitsche.* Untersuchung über die Echtheit der Doloneia.
- Nom. prop.* (Franke). De nominum propriorum epithetis Homeris.
- Odyssey* (Monro). Edition of Odyssey XIII.-XXIV.
- Orszulik.* Über das Verhältnis der Doloneia zu den übrigen Theilen der Ilias und zur Odyssee.
- Palaces* (Mosso). The Palaces of Crete and their Builders.
- Pausan.* (Frazer). Frazer's Pausanias's Description of Greece.
- Prellwitz.* Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache.
- Problem* (Geddes). The Problem of the Homeric Poems.
- Q.E.* Quaestiones Epicae.
- Q.H.* Quaestiones Homericæ.
- Q.L. (Hoch).* Quaestiones Lexicologicae ad Homerum pertinentes.
- Quellen* (Mülder). Die Ilias und ihre Quellen.
- Quest.* (van Gennep). La Question d'Homère.
- Raleigh.* Shakespeare in English Men of Letters Series.
- Ranke.* Die Doloneia.
- Reallex.* (Schrader). Reallexikon indogermanischen Altertumskunde.
- Reichel.* Homerische Waffen.<sup>2</sup>
- R.G.E. (Murray).* Rise of the Greek Epic.
- Robert.* Studien zur Ilias.
- Sagenp.* (Nitzsch). Die Sagenpoesie der Griechen.
- S. and A.* Sikes and Allen's edition of the Homeric Hymns.
- Schuchhardt.* Schliemann's Excavations, English Translation.
- Schulze.* Quaestiones Epicae.
- Scrip. Min.* (Evans). Scripta Minoa, vol. i.
- Seiler.* Homeric Lexicon.
- Solmsen.* Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laut- und Verslehre
- Studien* (Wecklein). Studien zur Ilias.

- Studs.* (Clerke). Familiar Studies in Homer.
- Studs.* (Gladstone). Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age.
- Terret.* Homère.
- Textkrit.* (Wecklein). Über die Methode d. Textkritik, etc., des Homers.
- Thumb.* Zur Geschichte d. griechischen Digamma in I. F., ix. 294 ff.
- Ursprung* (Bonitz). Über d. Ursprung d. homerischen Gedichte.<sup>5</sup>
- Ursprung* (Schneider). Über d. Ursprung d. homerischen Gedichte.
- Van L. and da C.* van Leeuwen and Mendes da Costa's editions of the Iliad and Odyssey.
- Verb* (G. Curtius). The Greek Verb (English Translation).
- Vindic.* (Buchholz). Vindiciae carminum Homericorum.
- Vocalcontr.* (Bechtel). Vocalcontraction bei Homer.
- Vogrinz.* Grammatik d. homerischen Dialektes.
- Widerspr.* (Rothe). Die Bedeutung d. Widersprüche f. d. homerische Frage.
- Wiederhlyg.* (Christ). Die Wiederholungen gleicher u. ähnlicher Verse in d. Ilias.
- Wiederhlyg.* (Rothe). Die Bedeutung d. Wiederholungen f. d. homerische Frage.
- Wiederhlyg.* (Sittl). Die Wiederholungen in d. Odyssee.
- Wocht. k. P.* Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie.
- Zur Chron.* (Christ). Zur Chronologie d. altgriechischen Epos.
- Zw. h. W.* (Friedländer). Zwei homerische Wörterverzeichnisse.

## CHAPTER I

### THE STORY OF THE DOLONEIA

IN the end of the ninth book, I, the failure of the mission to Achilles is reported by Odysseus, and is a sore blow to the Achaean chiefs. Diomede, who is impatient of all this discussion, alone speaks out, and with perfect unconcern. The secession of Achilles and the disasters of the day have had no effect on him. He had told Agamemnon bluntly, earlier in the evening, that he was a coward to think of flight; he is now just as disrespectful to Nestor's plan of conciliating Achilles. They had done wrong to approach the sulking Myrmidon. Diomede has a mind of his own; no parley with the enemy within or without the gates. For the present, rest, and a bold front to the Trojans in the morning, and then, a fight to a finish. His advice is accepted with acclamation, as it always is, and the chiefs disperse to their quarters. It is not stated that Agamemnon himself is encouraged or comforted by the speech of his youthful subaltern. His dejection, we can assume, is too deep. He must refrain, for the moment, from renewing his suggestion that the host should abandon the enterprise and return to Greece. But he fears, we shall see, now that all hope of Achilles' assistance is gone, that even escape with their lives may be denied them.

The tenth book, K, may be divided, as by some editors, into a *Νυκτευρσία*, or *Night Alarm*, 1-298, and a Doloneia proper, 299-579.

We give, to begin with, only a brief summary of the contents of the lay. We shall know them intimately before we are done with them, for they have been well sifted by the critics. But much trouble would have been saved had they been studied more

carefully,<sup>1</sup> and, we must add, with less prejudice. More than that, the critics have too little regard to what is told us in the rest of the *Iliad*, from which there emerge several points that must not be overlooked.<sup>2</sup> Agamemnon is in the lowest depths of despair. He believes Zeus has deserted him and is favouring Hector; he knows he has alienated his following by his foolish quarrel with Achilles; and the blow Hector had dealt him during the day makes him fear that the worst may still be to come. Alone at his hut, he is seized by a new dread (Grimm, 24). The Trojans, as they have not returned to the city, may be thinking to rush the camp, and a night attack will be a horror's crown of horror. If we bear all this in mind, we cease to wonder that he cannot sleep, that he seeks Nestor, whom he *can* trust, and that they visit the guards. As there is no sign, so far, of a movement on the enemy's part, they sit down and confer with other chiefs who have been summoned. The result is that some one must venture across the plain and make certain, if he can, whether there is to be an attack or not. Diomede volunteers, and selects Odysseus as his companion. They arm themselves, of course with gear suitable for night work, commend themselves to the protection of Athéné, and set out. With that the first part of the lay ends, the poet hinting, in the words of Odysseus to the goddess, that there is something more to be recounted than a bit of simple eavesdropping.

The scene changes to the Trojan side. Hector would like to know if the Greeks are meditating flight. Dolon offers to ascertain, and having obtained from his chief a promise on oath of the car and horses of Achilles as his reward, starts on his way to the camp. Odysseus and Diomede, seeing him coming, let him pass, give chase and capture him. Questioned by Odysseus he at once lays the blame on Hector, gives all necessary information, and tells, to save his life, of a new contingent of Thracians under Rhēsus, lord of a splendid equipage and golden mail. He is then slain, and the two heroes proceed to the Thracian bivouac,

<sup>1</sup> For example. Bernhardy objected (vol. i. 164) that the lay knows only one son of Nestor. The old man himself says, K 170, that he has *sons*. Dr. Verrall (*Quart. Rev.* 1908, 75 f.) observes that the author of K does not know the Wall. But he does; he mentions the (or a) gate. And see p. 181 *infra*. Jahn, in his monograph, p. 4, wonders

why Nestor hopes, K 536 f., that Odysseus and Diomede may have had the luck to carry off horses. What more natural, when he had heard the sound of a pair making for the camp? And so on.

<sup>2</sup> The references are given, pp. 151 f. *infra*.

where they slaughter the king and twelve of his nobles, and secure the famous steeds and (apparently) the car also. They ride or drive back to the scene of their encounter with Dolon, recover his accoutrements, which they had bestowed against their return, and then continue their way to the Achaeans, where they are welcomed and warmly congratulated. After a bath, they sit down to a meal. With libation in gratitude to Athéné the Book closes.

To the ordinary reader it seems a simple, straightforward, and interesting story, with a natural sequence of events, and well adapted to its environment in the *Iliad*. To the "critical actuary," for whom it certainly was not written, it wears a very different aspect. He imposes strange limitations on the poet, and subjects his work, both in itself and in its relations to other lays of the *Iliad*, to a strictly logical interpretation. When he examines the Doloneia sentence by sentence,<sup>1</sup> he finds many faults; there are few vices known to Homeric criticism that have not been imputed to its author. We can hardly be surprised. Objectors who are not free from bias, and who, in Professor Saintsbury's phrase, "potter overmuch about details," can have no difficulty in detecting blemishes in an old epic story, which tells of a night of confusion and terror, and of an exploit to which there is no parallel in the poems. It is true of the Doloneia, as of other parts of the *Iliad*, but in a special degree of the Doloneia, that it has been discredited by what Mr. Gladstone termed the precipitate application of the canons of modern prose—we might almost go further and say the principles of judicial procedure or historical enquiry—to the oldest poetry.

In particular, its critics shew a continual weakness for what Mr. Andrew Lang has called "the fallacy of disregarding the Homeric poet's audience."<sup>2</sup> The actors in the Doloneia must behave and speak, the story must run with a smoothness and precision, to please modern tastes. It may be urged that the lay be judged by its probable effect on the public for whom it was composed. Judge it, if you please, as a work of art, by canons which you say are for all time. Even so, you may not disregard Goethe's dictum that any such work is not to be "praised and

<sup>1</sup> If this sounds exaggerated, reference may be made to some of the monographs, as those of Kuhlbars, Jahr, and Sickel.

of controversy, be a preferable term. The poet's object is, in Mülder's words (*Quellen*, 342), *kräftigste Wirkung auf das Publikum*.

<sup>2</sup> "Public" would perhaps, in view

blamed *only* in detail." Nor may you disregard contemporary conditions. There may be artistic defects according to our highly elaborated modern notions. The point is, that the early hearer or reader would not mark them, and would regard them as trifles, if he did (Cauer, *Grdfrgn.* 384). He would test the lay by its effect on him as a whole, and beyond that only by certain prominent points in the story. Naber (*Q.H.* 166), criticising Lachmann, compares an ancient audience to children, *qui sola aurium voluptate omnia metiuntur*.

Let us look at the canto then from such a point of view. The early part bores the critics. It is to them unduly long. Their impatience seems unreasonable. An introduction to a stirring adventure is surely not unusual. Rather it strikes us as somewhat like Shakespeare's plan, described on Professor Bradley's authority by Miss Stawell (*H. and Il.* 49), of beginning with "a short scene either full of life or stir, or in some other way arresting." That is precisely what we have in K. We cannot give up, with some critics, the arresting lines on Agamemnon's distress. How could the situation be recalled more effectively for any audience than by an opening scene shewing the Achaean leader, the author of all the mischief, aghast at the glare and blare from the lines of the exulting Trojans, and beside himself with dread of what may yet befall? He is for the moment the central figure, and none the less prominent later in the action that he is, for reasons easy to state, displaced to a great extent by Nestor. And the rest of the Introduction would be similarly arresting. It is largely a picture of the camp by night. The Trojan arrangements had been sketched in Θ; those of the Achaeans come naturally in K. The *Ναύσταθμος*, we know, interested the ancients. An early audience would surely like to hear of the positions of the contingents; of the size of the camp with the "thousand ships," as indicated by the many roads through it and the ease with which men and animals could get lost in the dark; of the way the warriors passed the night, some under cover, some in the open, all with arms at hand; and of the weapons they caught up when roused by an alarm, and the garments they donned,—garments that cause such a shock to some critics that they adopt the high tone of the *Tailor and Cutter*, and pass serious censure on the poet for his want of taste in dress. Such an audience would appreciate the description of Diomede's bivouac,

and they could hardly fail to enjoy the scene between Nestor and that eager young chief, who had been protesting against the fuss with Achilles, and who utters a half growl when roused from sleep. No fears were keeping him awake. A fool could see, he had said, that Troy was doomed. They would like the description of the lonely steading in the jungle and the prowling beast that keeps the dogs awake; any one would who has had experience of life in forest country. We can believe unhesitatingly that they would regard the account of the arming of the heroes for this unique exploit as most natural and interesting. Above all they would know that what was promised them would be worth listening to, when it is Diomede who adventures, when he selects Odysseus as his companion, and when the two disappear into the night, across the bloody field, "like a pair of lions." They would have sympathy with the prayers of the departing heroes, which (as some one once said) close the scene like the "God send the good craft safe to haven" in an old ship's manifest. In the *do ut des* of Diomede's petition was comprised much of the ancient appreciation of God's way to man. Many a worthy Thane and many a ruffian who listened to the lay had doubtless himself made the same bargain with Heaven. There is no lack of interest in the introductory part.

Then the adventure. The Achaeans are not looking for great results from their enterprise. With the Trojans hopes are high. The idea that the enemy have had enough and are taking to their ships is Hector's own, and just what we expect from his sanguine spirit after a first success in the field. The camp is already his and all that it contains. During the day he had set his heart on Nestor's shield and Diomede's corslet, and had driven their owners with ignominy to the shelter of the wall. He little thinks, as he selects his man, what a surprise for himself and his bravest and best those two chiefs are at that moment planning. He readily yields to the presumptuous demand for the team that Achilles drives, and Dolon starts in the best of fettle.  $\beta\eta\,\rho'\,\dot{\alpha}\nu'$   $\ddot{\alpha}\delta\delta\nu\,\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\omega\varsigma$ . You can almost hear him whistle. The author of *Scouting for Boys* (see p. 35) should be charmed with the description. No doubts disturb Dolon. He has assured his leader that he will not be a "vain spy," and that he will penetrate to Agamemnon's ship and learn all secrets. But it is probably the splendid addition to his household wealth that is uppermost

in the thoughts of this master of “much gold and much bronze.” Hector no doubt knew his man when he made oath,

By none but Dolon shall this prize be borne,  
And him alone the immortal steeds adorn.

But footsteps behind cause a sudden check to the spy's exultation. He is to be balked after all; Hector must have ordered messengers to recall him.<sup>1</sup> He stands to meet them, and is soon undeceived. Two friends sent after him would hardly carry sword and spear and shield. The boar's tushes on the casque of one of them have a grisly look. They are messengers of death, and he turns and “stirs his limbs,” no longer for the great prize that had tempted him, but for dear life, as Hector that sent him forth is himself to run, before two suns have set, in the supreme scene of the *Iliad*.<sup>2</sup> The chase is a piece of spirited description; there is nothing more vigorous of its kind in either poem. Critics who have felt the keen joy of riding after hounds will appreciate the hunting simile. The scene lives before us in every detail, and could not have failed to hold those for whom it was written.

Dolon is caught, and, when the two Achaeans are done with him, is put out of the way. The poor scout was not cast in the heroic mould, and the little we know of him does not do him credit. Vergil alone has a word for him, we hope a true one, when he describes his son Eumēdes as *nomine avrum referens, animo manibusque parentem*. His part in the epic is brief and inglorious. In the rest of the *Iliad*, as the critics note with triumph, he is not so much as mentioned. Like Rhēsus, he appears only to die. But they themselves have striven to build for him an everlasting name. As long, we will not say as Ida stands, but as the Higher Criticism harries the *Iliad*, Dolon, son of Eumēdes, will not be forgotten.

Then the *dénouement*—the slaughter of the sleeping Thracians and the rush back to the ships. How would the deed appeal to the ancients? Would they abhor it as butchery, or glory in it as a fine piece of derring do? In our day some think it low and unheroic work; others that in Achaean times an enemy was an

<sup>1</sup> Cauer (*Grdfrgn.* 407) and some commentators take ἐλπέρο, 355, = “hoped.” They think the poet means to point Dolon's cowardice. He hoped that Hec-

tor was after all recalling him. μεμαῶς, 339, seems distinctly against this interpretation.

<sup>2</sup> ἀλλὰ περὶ ψυχῆς, X 161.

enemy and fair prey wherever found, and that what the scholiasts term *τὸ κινδυνώδες* affords some justification for the poet. We leave the point for the present and turn to others which we think the men of old would not be likely to overlook, if their interest in the bard and his song is correctly described in the Homeric epic.

The obvious one is that Hector has been outwitted. And the outwitting of an enemy is a favourite theme. *δόλος* is always good; a triumph of *δόλος* over *δόλος* is better. “For ‘tis the sport to have the enginer Hoist with his own petar.” Instances of trickery in the poems are collected by Bischoff, *Hom. Poesie*, 136. In the days of the *Iliad* “we are many centuries yet before the age of chivalry. The Greek instinct preferred craft to force as frankly as does an American Indian” (Lawton, 23). Craft is of the essence of some of the best episodes in the poems. The gods themselves are adepts; Athené is proud of her proficiency, v. 299. The critics sometimes bowdlerise, affecting a dainty horror of *τὸ ἀπρεπές*. *Castum esse decet piūm poetam!* Fortunately there is nothing to shock them in the Doloneia. The *δόλος* in it is clean, and legitimate; all is fair in war. Stier thinks the *Iliad* must have a lay in which “men of craft” take a part. And the honours of the game are all with Odysseus and Diomede. Hector’s hopes have had a miserable issue. The failure of Dolon was nothing serious; the loss of the leader of a fresh contingent and his henchmen was something to make the Trojan commander think hard. This was not what he had looked for from a beaten and broken foe. And the perpetrators of the insult are away with the famous team, merry over the success of their escapade,<sup>1</sup> while the pair the gods gave to Peleus are still in their stalls by the sea. As for the scout who was to bring back the glorious news that Troyland was at last to be free from “the dogs brought thither by fate”—*illum Tydides alio pro talibus ausis Afficit pretio*.<sup>2</sup> He is lying on the plain naked and headless, “dear to the dogs and vultures,” and his fellows are howling in panic about the corpses of the Thracians, while Odysseus and Diomede are enjoying the welcome of their friends.

At every point the Achaeans have scored a success. The lay is thoroughly Achaean; the scholiasts saw that. C. Schmid (*Hom. Stud.* ii. 19) describes the incident as *Revanchepolitik*. “It

<sup>1</sup> πόλλα' ἐγγελῶντες, Eurip. *Rhesus*, 815.

<sup>2</sup> *Aen.* xii. 351.

affords an agreeable relief to the national distress" (Mure, i. 266). The Trojans had had the best of it during the day, and Zeus had no doubt retired to rest, after the stormy scene with his consort in Θ, well satisfied that he had at last roused himself to fulfil his promise to Thetis and made a good beginning. The Achaeans, battered in the field and repulsed by Achilles, are sounding the depths. A small diversion, out of deference to an Achaean audience, was surely not an unnatural proceeding on the part of the poet. He cannot reverse the triumph of Hector; but he can—*σιναχθόμενος τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς*, as a scholiast on another book puts it—take the sting out of it for the moment. He does so by letting his countrymen, though penned behind their wall, avenge their defeat in a way that does not spoil his own plan or interfere with the scheme of the Providence that rules from Olympus. The expedition had this result, that the gloom in the camp was dispelled. Joy came with the light of the morning. And the critics find the lay that tells this "impossible" in its place in the *Iliad*! It raises its brazen front, they say, *zwecklos da!*

Ranke notes the "Tragic Irony" in the story. You find in it, if you please, what was afterwards styled a *Peripeteia*.<sup>1</sup> The terms had not been invented in the days of the epic, but the men of the time could appreciate a turning of the tables as they had it in the Lay in θ, when at a certain point the curtain falls, or in the opening of χ, when the avenging Odysseus reveals himself from his beggar's rags (Jebb, 11). *πόλλ' ἀναστρέφει θεός*. Hector's dreams are rudely interrupted. His disappointment is not dwelt on, not even mentioned, but an ancient audience might picture to themselves his face when he was told what had happened, and might contrast his feelings then with his arrogant confidence at the gathering that sent Dolon to his death. It is quite in the way of Homer's simple narrative art to leave a little to the imagination. We are left to image to ourselves something that is not, in the poet's own phrase, *ἀριξήλως εἰρημένον*. And so it is here. The poet could well afford to leave it to hearers of the lay to measure the chagrin of the Trojan commander. In the same way, it should be noted, he has not thought it necessary to remind them that the divine steeds, so generously made over to Dolon,

<sup>1</sup> To which, in the *Iliad*, though K is not used as an illustration, a new importance is attached by Adam, *Der*

*ursprüngl. u. echte Schluss d. Odyssee*, chaps. i. and ii. Homer, as has often been said, was the first tragic poet.

are soon to drag the donor himself across the plain by the heels. His audience would not, perhaps, forget it. Their familiarity with the saga is frequently assumed in the poems.

Many modern critics seem not to be attracted by the story of the Doloneia. To some, as Dr. Leaf (*Compan.* 192), the points we have noted are the outcome of "an evident straining after violent contrast which is quite unlike the reserve of the finest epic style, or indeed of good Greek work at any period." We think the straining, far from evident, is carefully suppressed, and we have not seen it stated that the best Greek criticism, ever at any period, marked and condemned this blot on the Doloneia. Nor do modern critics approve of the story as a well-rounded whole. They are cheated of the *μῆτις ἀμύμων* of 19, and the *βουλὴ κερδαλέη* of 43 f., announced at the outset, "with a flourish of trumpets," as they describe it, to excite our expectations. They are too much cumbered about small things. Events do not always fall out as foreshadowed by Homer. Sufficient for the moment are the needs of the moment. Fräulein Jordan has well observed (*Erzählgsst.* 62) that the weakest motive is legitimate "if it helps the action for the time being." (Cf. Römer, *Hom. Gest. u. Gestaltgn.* 19 f.) It is the "situation of the moment" that leads the poet (Harder, *Homer*, 247), and the critics, failing to observe this, detect discrepancies. When the action in the present case had culminated in a "great deed"—one, as Odysseus had prayed, that stirred the Trojans mightily—would old-time hearers complain of the way in which the bard had led up to it? Two brave men had saved the camp, or at least put it out of its suspense, and for the time being restored Achaean prestige; and the listener of a simple age, not given to carping at the merely trivial, would be well content with what was offered him.

We shall see in the next chapter what an astonishing variety of opinion the narrative of the Doloneia has evoked. We think we see good ground for ranging ourselves with those who commend it. It may be admitted that modern critics could have improved it from their own points of view, had they been present to advise at its creation. But to the men of old, with their love for the saga and its heroes, and no doubt quick to seize the points of a joyous tale from it, made for their entertainment only, the Doloneia as it stands must, we think, have appealed irresistibly. "Intense enjoyment of life may be regarded as the major key

which dominates the *Iliad*" (Campbell, *Relig. in Greek Lit.* 77), and the Doloneia is, in its active part especially, " rammed with life." It has the " bright speed " which Professor Mackail admires in the epic. Contrast its healthy freshness with the excessive sentimentality that mars the beauty of Vergil's imitation. The *Rhēsus* of the Attic stage is not to be named with it. If it be, as many think, the work of a mere cento-maker or of an inferior rhapsode, we would that Heaven had sent us more such. We are satisfied with the product of what is deemed a despicable decadence. We believe the Thanes who listened to the Lay of Dolon in sub-Mycenaean holds or at Ionian courts, could hardly have been better pleased with it, had they known it was from the hand of the author of the *Mēnis* itself. It may be they knew it was. The critics think they know it was not. We may not be able to prove that it was. But we think we can give many good reasons for our belief that they have failed to prove their negative.

## CHAPTER II

### SOME OPINIONS ON THE DOLONEIA

WE have stated in the preface that it is the fashion to decry the Doloneia as, almost by general consent, inferior and late. It is "persistently written down" (Mr. Allen in *C.R.* xx. 194). We now pause to consider whether the audit of the lay stands as badly as those who write about it would have us believe. It does not, by any means. Many of its detractors would have used more guarded language had they known Doloneian literature better. To assist a judgment in this matter, we propose to set out a number of opinions on two points—the quality of the Doloneia as epic poetry, and its age.

On the first we learn the worst from a recent utterance. Professor Henry (*C.R.* xix. 192) describes K as "by common consent one of the most worthless books of the *Iliad* from a poetical point of view." "Inevitable blundering" is its author's characteristic. This is the most sweeping condemnation of all. There is hardly "a kindly dump in it." Robert's censure is also severe (*Stud.* 501 f., 574). The poet's ideas are mean and his poetry unpleasing. But others temper their disapproval with some words of commendation. Dr. Leaf can admit, in his *Introduction*, that the lay "contains a series of vivid and attractive pictures," and (*Compan.* 193) that "the story is vigorous enough." Holm (*Ad Car. Lachm.* 10) allows it to be "an *epyllion* composed with consummate art," and G. Curtius (*Andeutgn.* 43, 47), though he detects some failure of poetic power, concurs in the appropriateness of the praise. Nitzsch (*Beitr.* 378) finds it "a lively narrative," and Bergk (vol. i. 599) "a valuable piece of old poetry." Ranke quotes Gruppe (*Ariadné*, 278 ff.), as commending its "dramatic liveliness and genuine poetry." He himself (*Die Dol.* 47 ff.), though he denies to the lay the essential qualities

of a genuine work of art, pronounces it a work of rich imagination (p. 82). Jacob (*Entstg.* 239), while he thinks much of it unworthy of Homer, can say of it that it is in great measure a "beautiful *Nocturne*." Professor Mahaffy (*H.G.L.* 67) says the author was a competent poet. Hoffmann (*Q.H.* ii. 219) thinks he was no worse than the author of  $\Psi$ , and for  $\Psi$  we have the eulogy of Schiller. Nitsche specifies some admirable qualities in the narrative, though he thinks a certain poetical crudeness somewhat spoils them. Miss Clerke (*Studs.* 100) speaks of the "animated story." Bréal (*Journ. des Savs.* 1903, 146), though he is ready to sacrifice the lay, considers it full of dramatic interest. To Orszulik the much criticised opening is "specially fine," and the whole in language and expression hardly inferior to the good and original parts of the *Iliad*,—from which, however, his work absolutely dissociates K. Jahr, after some pages of unmixed fault-finding, ends off thus,—*res ipsa, quae narratur, semper plausu omnium, qui Homero operam dant, digna est.* See also Erhardt, *Entstg.* 160 and ff., Giseke, *Hom. Forschgn.* 251, Cauer, *Grdfrgn.* 440 f., 501 f., and Am.-H., *Anh.* to K, *Einleitung*. And all this praise, some of it by no means faint praise, is from critics who hold that the Doloneia is late and generally inferior.

It is a common accusation that the author is a "clumsy imitator," who is guilty of "glaring" plagiarism from other parts of the epics, but it is one of the weakest of the charges that have been levelled at him. See Chap. XIV. *infra*. Diffuseness in description, superficiality, want of clearness, and confusion of motive are also imputed, as we shall see, but almost wholly with reference to the introductory part of the lay. Others again find a less dignified style than in the rest of the poems. Father Browne thinks (*Handbook*, 111) that K is "barely Homeric"; Jebb, that "the characteristic nobleness of the *Iliad* here sinks to a lower style and tone."<sup>1</sup> Croiset (*H.G.L.* i. 139) misses "the grand manner of the Quarrel and the *Aristeia* of Diomede," and so Ed. Meyer (*Gesch. d. Altert.* ii. 405). E. H. Meyer (*Hom. u. d. Il.* 136) blames the poet for letting the heroes sink to shameless cruelty and robbery with cowardly brutality. Dr. Monro, in his *Introduction* to K, calls it a "farcical interlude." As such it is "out of harmony with the tragic elevation of the *Iliad*." But

<sup>1</sup> *Homer*, 123. See also 156, where his selection of the *Catalogue* as another

part of the *Iliad* that differs from the rest in style is somewhat surprising.

the *Iliad*, though always elevated, is not always tragic. "Tragical, comical, historical, pastoral, are terms not sufficiently various to denote the variety of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*" (Ker, 16). Mr. Lang (*H. and E.* 148) contests Monro's view. Terret also (*Homère*, 229 f.) finds "nothing incompatible with the habitual severity of the *Iliad*." We believe that to be a perfectly accurate appreciation. Grote, on the other hand (ii. 130), thinks K "is conceived in a lower vein," but he adds the reservation, "so far as we can trust our modern ethical sentiment." This caution does not seem to appeal to the many critics of K. But surely it is the sentiment of the men of old to which we should have regard. Their tastes and standards, if they had any standards, were not those of our modern critics. Had they been, and had their singers suited them, we should have had, as Kammer says (*Einheit*, 39), "a cold production that the understanding would not object to, but not a Homeric lay." Am.-H., *i.e.*, think the Doloneia could not have failed in its effect on those who heard it sung.

There are, after all, few critics who have not something to say in praise of the poetry. Among those who are wholly appreciative are Gladstone (*Studs.* iii. 389 ff.), Mure (i. 264 ff.), and Lang (*H. and A.* chap. xiii.). Mure especially commends the Homeric purity of the style; there are few parts of the epics more worthy of the genuine Homer. The verdict of Professor Murray (*R.G.E.* 165 n.), who is not altogether friendly to the lay, is that it is "a brilliantly written book." His opinion is as far removed from Professor Henry's as the east is from the west. Mr. Blakeney, in his *Translation of the Iliad*, uses the same words, and adds, "without it the *Iliad* would undoubtedly be poorer." Probably no other book in either poem has evoked such utterly contradictory opinions. Bougot (*Étude*, p. 198) and Terret (*Homère*, 229 ff.) are loud in their praises, and so Kammer (*op. cit.* 36 ff., and *Ästh. Komm. z. Il.* 215 ff.). The Doloneia "abounds in fine traits." One has no right to speak of "absurdity, poverty, carelessness and excess." Grimm, in the course of an exhaustive analysis admires without stint the Homeric spirit, the delineation of character and other features. Homer loves, like his successors throughout the centuries, to describe "the dim and quiet night." The adventure is a piece of fine poetry. Harder (*Homer*, 234) finds it entrancing. To Lehrs

(*Kl. Schrift.* 12 n.) the description of the anxiety and fears of the Achaeans cooped up in the dark is wonderful. Jäger (*Hom. Aph.* 228; cf. *Hom. u. Hor.* 82) declares that the Doloneia is equal to the best. Schneider (*Ursprung*, 26 f.) has high praise for it. He speaks with feeling, and with peculiar authority. To appreciate its scenes, one should be able to live through them in imagination, or better still, as one gathers Schneider himself has done, should have passed a night in camp with the enemy at hand, or have been despatched in the dark on a reconnaissance of his position. *Non cuivis contingit.*

Next as to the period in which K took its origin. All the critics, a few Unitarians excepted, are satisfied that it is late. But they do not all mean the same thing. "Late" is a vague word, very useful to the Dissector. For K, some three centuries separate extreme views. But nearly all are sure that the lay is later than the *Mēnis*, and many, as Ludwich,<sup>1</sup> that it is the latest of all. So sure are they that they do not trouble to give reasons, unless perhaps that its language is peculiar, or that it is "stuffed with oddities." They rely on common consent. Some, as Bergk (597 ff.), Erhardt, *l.c.*, H. D. Müller (*Hist.-mythol. Untersuchgn.* 71), Schultz (*Das Lied vom Zorn Achills*, 29 f.), and others, who believe that it was a separate lay before a place was found for it in the *Iliad*, are disposed to allow that K is ancient *au fond*. Mülder (*Altion.* 20) even includes it in certain groups of lays which were bound together later by the *Wrath*. But generally lateness is assumed. A critic using K to illustrate any point simply says, as Bethe says (*Hom. u. d. Heldensage*, p. 4), *das der Ilias spät eingefügte K.*

There are scholars who assign it to a particular century or period. Dr. Leaf's views have developed since his first edition and the *Companion* were published. He now thinks the poet "had the *Odyssey* rather than the *Iliad* in his mind"; and the language, and the lion-skin theory propounded by Erhardt, lead him to assign K to the second half of the seventh century B.C. Father Browne (*Handbook*, 110 ff.) follows him. Jebb (*Homer*, 163) gives "perhaps *circ.* 750-600 B.C." Brandt (*N. J. f. Philol.* 1888, 81 ff.) thinks K came into the *Iliad* with a second

<sup>1</sup> *Üb. d. Verhältn. d. pisisis. Redaction*  
7. On p. 8 of his *Die Rhapsodien der*  
*Ilias A-S* appears the suggestion, that

K was added at the last to the other 23 books to make up the two dozen.

"enlargement or working-over" about 700 B.C. Fick (*Iliad*, 383, 388 f.) proceeds on a ground of his own. Hipponax, about 550 B.C., alludes to the Doloneia.<sup>1</sup> The verses do not agree with K, which does not know Rhēsus as from Ainos. But Fick assumes an alteration of the text of K after Hipponax' days. K is one of the episodes added to the *Iliad* after the insertion of Fick's Οἰτος Ἰλίου in his "enlarged *Iliad*." As the Οἰτος appears to be of the same period as the *Cypria*, say 776 B.C., his *termini* for K are that year and 550. E. H. Meyer (*Achilleis*, 373, 385; cf. his *Hom. u. d. Il.* 124) would bring the origin of the lay down to between 700 and 600, in the age of the Hymns. Wilamowitz (*Über das Θ der Ilias*) seeks to prove that K and I, then *Einzel-lieder*, were brought into the *Iliad*, by means of Θ, in the seventh century. Robert (*Stud.* 574) puts K after his "fourth *Iliad*" and before 600 B.C. Other high authorities, however, go further back. Naber (*Q.H.* 3, 216 ff.) assigns it to his "fourth age," which "nearly touches the eighth century." Dr. Monro, as I gather from pp. 291, 328, 367 n., 371, and 455 of his *Odyssey*, thought K older than ω, the Cyclices and 776 B.C. His view seems to be much the same as Christ's (*Zur Chronol.* 60), who believes K was added to the *Iliad* in the end of the ninth or the beginning of the eighth century, and Erhardt's (*Entstg.* 505). G. Curtius (*Andeutgn.* 47) classes the author with "the late *Nachdichters*," but not so late as the authors of the *Catalogues*, who were the latest of all. But many think that the *Catalogues* are very ancient work.

Some authorities date the Doloneia with reference to the *Odyssey*. The method is not satisfying, as opinions about the origin and age of the *Odyssey*, and of the poems supposed to have been welded together to make it, are somewhat diverse. These attempts are based on parallel passages, a bad criterion, the application of which to K will be discussed in Chap. XIV. *infra*. Here I mention some results. Gemoll (*Hermes*, xv. 557 ff.) proves that K is later than the *Odyssey* as we now have it; Düntzer (*H.A.* 472), by the same method, that it is older than the oldest part of that epic. Sittl (*Wiederhlg.* 68) holds that it was composed after the two principal parts of the *Odyssey*, but before the *Telemachy*, and Busolt (*Hist. Gr.* 132, 137 n.) accepts his

<sup>1</sup> Bergk, *Fragm.* 42:—  
ἐπ' ἀρμάτων τε καὶ Θρηϊκῶν πώλων

λευκῶν λόν κοτ' ἔγγύς Ἰλίου πύργων  
ἀπηναρίσθη Ρῆσος Αινῶν πάλμυς.

conclusion. That K is younger than the *Odyssey* is clear to Wecklein (*Studien*, 34 n.) on a comparison of K 243 and a 65. On that greatly debated parallel see p. 117 *infra*. Van Herwerden's opinion to the same effect (*Q.E.* 16 f.) is apparently approved by van Leeuwen (*Ench.* xxxi.), and he, it should be noted, thinks (*ibid.* xxxvi.) that both epics were complete, in about their present shape, in the eighth century. Orszulik is in general agreement with them. K is at least not older than the *Odyssey*. Professor Mahaffy (*H.G.L.* 56) thinks it may be "as late as the lays of the *Odyssey*."

Gladstone, Mure, Lang, Allen, Bougot, Terret and other Unitarians believe that K is and has always been an integral part of the *Iliad*, and that it was composed by the one poet to whom we owe the other 23 books and the *Odyssey*.

It is clear from this review that there is a body of highly respectable opinion in favour of, or not severely hostile to, the Doloneia. There are some even among its enemies who, although they regard it as late compared with their *Ur-Ilias*, are nevertheless ready to admit that it is ancient, and many of them admire, some of them highly, the work which its author has bequeathed to us. With this encouragement, then, we proceed to our own examination of the case against it.

## CHAPTER III

### INTERPOLATION

OUR first step will be to examine the traditional text of K. The Higher Criticism has dealt somewhat roughly with it. How far are the alterations to be accepted? We have to consider what interpolations have been proved, and whether verbal corruptions have been established, and cured by remedies that can be admitted. We shall find, as a result of this examination, that many of the difficulties and objections of some critics have disappeared on the shewing of other authorities.

And first, the interpolations. We take Fick's list, as the passages he would expunge, printed in small type in his *Iliad*, pp. 463 ff., include nearly all that have ever been condemned. Fick is no doubt a giant among the philologists, but as a critic he seems easily prejudiced and inclined to wild surmise. Professor Mahaffy's description of his procedure (*H.G.L.* 73) might be extended to many other Dissectors. "Lines superfluous to his scheme are rejected . . . for any reason that comes to hand," even "because *they can be spared!*" I may refer also to Rothe in *Jb.* 1887, 279; Gemoll in *Jb. Bursian*, 1888, 31; Hennings in *Wocht. k. P.* 1910, 490, and Mr. Agar's *Homerica*. It is not difficult to break up a Homeric canto in this way. A recent treatise seems to rely on the same method. See Rothe in *Jb.* 1909, 227, on W. Witte's *Stud. z. Hom.* Almost any line in K that contains anything that can be deemed remarkable may be rejected.

The golden rule is Calebow's (*Il. lib. oct.* 66). "Before a line is removed from its place, it must be shewn that it cannot be tolerated there." The burden is on the ejector. It is not enough to shew that matter "does not square with *our* notions of what is consistent," or right, or pleasing, or  $\tau\ddot{o}\pi\rho\acute{e}\pi\sigma\nu$ . That

is "convenient, but unscientific" (Mahaffy, *Macm. Mag.* xxxviii. 413). The contents of a passage are to be tested by other similar passages in the poems—*ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ποιήσεως ἐλέγχειν*—and, with due limitations, by the practice of other authors.<sup>1</sup> And a Dissector must be kept to the point, producing, as Blass requires, *τεκμήρια* as well as *σημεῖα*. Mere gibes at "leaden versifiers" and the "absurd race of interpolators" and their "utter sillinesses" (*prorsus ἀδιανόητα*) are irrelevant. And special objection must be taken to the common assumption that "every verse in Homer has its *one* appropriate place" (Lange in *Jb.* 1880, 138). Repetition is all over the poems. It must also be shewn that corruption of the text is not a possibility. And lastly, there is Kirchhoff's demand (*Odyssee*,<sup>2</sup> 590 f.), "which ought to become a canon in criticism" (Mahaffy, 61). The objector must state the motive for the interpolation, if deliberate, or, it may be added, furnish a reasonable explanation, if it be due to mistake. No one dare flout so reasonable a rule in the abstract. In practice, when there are inconvenient lines to be got rid of, it is more honoured by silent breach. Then, "almost anything is suspicious which is not indispensable" (Jebb, *Trachiniae*, lii.).

All such salutary restrictions have been greatly disregarded in Homeric criticism. The exacting enquirer has sought to purge the poems of everything that he personally considers objectionable, and to leave them in the "icily regular" condition in which he thinks they should have been composed, and as, in fact, he would himself have written them, *s'il avait eu le bonheur d'être Homère*. Where is the poet whose work would survive such treatment? Irregularities and difficulties are found in the works of other great poets (Erhardt, *Entstg.* xcvi ff., and Jevons, 40), as Vergil, Shakespeare, and Goethe. Readers of Faust should have patience with Homer (van Gennep, *Quest.* 22). Pope and others cut out of Shakespeare's works, as interpolations by "inferior hands" (the *Stümpers* of German criticism), everything that was not according to their several tastes. "There is an attractive simplicity about the method" (Raleigh, 108). That is the secret. Results are tangible, plentiful,—and easily got. So the craving to find interpolations grows with indulgence, and the

<sup>1</sup> Vahlen quoted by Rothe, *Jb.* 1889, 372.—For neglect of similar principles in Biblical Criticism, see Dr. A. B. Davidson's *Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 5.

epics are reduced to shreds. There is another serious consequence. Most passages in the poems have been suspected by one authority or another, ancient or modern, good or bad. For instance, out of 761 lines in P only 63 had, to the knowledge of Buchholz (*Vindic.* 143), never been questioned. Scotland left intact 80 out of 394 in *v*; Wetzel one-third of the lines in *II*. According to Hennings there are just 58 out of 586 in  $\theta$  that have not been objected to. Schultze commenced his *Ilias-Kritik* by cutting some 5000 lines out of the *Iliad* as additions by rhapsodes (*Jb.* 1895, 367, and 1902, 139, 157). What a power this gives the critics! If a line has to be removed, or if a Unitarian has used it as authority, it is found that an Alexandrian or some modern critic has suspected it, and that is often sufficient for its condemnation.

The interpolations alleged in K are examined in Appendix A, reference being made to the opinions of selected editors of both the disintegrating and the conservative schools. We submit that not one intrusion can be held to be conclusively established. In one or two cases all is not absolutely certain, but neither can interpolation be asserted positively. Some of the cases would never, we think, have attracted the attention of editors, had there not been a highly developed theory of Homeric interpolation to utilise on very small provocation.

To the majority of the critics, as they regard both epics as full of interpolations, this must be an unusual, an almost unheard of result. Yet it is not an altogether new view of K. Ranke (p. 79) finds no trace of "working over." Kluge, who cuts up the *Iliad* ruthlessly, declares K is "a unity" (*Entstg.* 153). So it will be for other parts of the poems, if fairly treated. Blass (*Interpol.*) gave short shrift to scores of athetes. He might have gone further. Mr. Allen's  $\sigma\phi\delta\rho\alpha\Tau\tau\omega\nu$  was fully justified. Jebb adjudged just one line in the *Trachiniae* spurious out of 120 that had been suspected or condemned by "scholars of mark." He blames the application to the textual criticism of poetry of a "habit of mind such as might be fostered by the habitual composition of telegrams." There are signs that the craft of the interpolation-hunter "is in danger to be set at nought." But it will be long ere the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* recover from his malfeasance.

Dr. Leaf finds few interpolations in K. But he only sees in

this exceptional solidarity corroboration of his conclusion that the lay is very late. He propounds a theory of "weathering" in his Introductions to A, K, Λ, Π. A modern lay will not have been tampered with. The more ancient the lay, the more it will have been interpolated. But time has smoothed over the joints of the insertions. Π has been "harmonised into a beautiful unity." He formerly thought (*Compan.* 202) that Λ was "a perfect piece of ancient and uncontaminated poetry," with the exception of its prologue and Nestor's story,—see Miss Stawell, *H. and Il.* 45. Now (*Introduction to Λ*) he perceives it has received accretions and undergone internal modifications which are "beyond our power to detect." If the new matter has become so welded into the corpus as to be not separately discernible, we may say, in the words of a legal maxim, *de non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio*.

But the great body of Dissectors can have nothing to say to this theory. Age has not weathered any part of the poems so as to secure it against desecration. In late and early tracts alike interpolations are found in numbers. And surely if, as Dr. Leaf himself holds, on B 36, and as seems incontestable, verbal corruption always tended to the more modern and familiar, then, the more the interpolations, the more the indications of recent origin. Again he finds—see, *e.g.*, his notes on P 76 and X 207—that there are interpolations from K in other parts of the *Iliad*. But if K was so late that matter could not be foisted *into* it, we cannot admit that lines could be transferred *from* it into other parts, for these were, *ex hypothesi*, as safe against interpolation as K itself. We doubt still more when he tells us in his *Introduction to Ψ*, itself a Late Expansion, that there were interpolators of great originality and skill and high inspiration, almost till the decline of the Epos.

This seems hardly satisfying. The Higher Criticism does not really seem to understand these interpolating phantoms of the past. They are all but imaginary. But they have become very real beings to the critics. As we read Dissecting treatises, it is as if there had always been but one copy of the poems, which any inferior poet in Greece had access to and full liberty to spoil. For the intruder is generally a "duffer" or "wretched simpleton," and his work "bungling." See Volkmann, *Nachträge*, ii. 16, for the technical expressions used of interpolators in German treatises.

But there is little *direct* evidence of the existence of these spoilers. Who were they? *Bearbeiters*? We know of the Pisistratean *Ordner* only, and he, after a very precarious career, is dead to the great majority of scholars. See pp. 135 f. *infra*. Homerids? Dr. Monro refuses to believe they ever existed (*Odyssey*, 398 ff.). And cf. Jebb, 170; Leaf, vol. I. xviii. f.; Volkmann, *Gesch. u. Krit.* 358, and *Jb.* 1895, 15. But Mr. Allen, in a very exhaustive paper in *C.Q.* i. 135 ff., has come to the conclusion that they were a real guild in Chios. I do not, however, find in the essay any reason for believing that they were given to interpolating the work of their ancestor in the way Dissectors assume. But the rhapsodes? They are very popular. We may put that to the account of Wolf and the votaries of oral transmission. But oral transmission is not required now. Rhapsodes, we know, recited, and possibly altered and added to their text. But that these additions became permanent is an assumption. Rhapsodes existed in the sixth century B.C., and no doubt practised their art long before. But Solon regulated recitation in that century, and that (*H. and A.* 318, quoting Monro) means that there was an official text. The veneration for the poems which Solon's action implies—and his action is better vouched than that of Pisistratus—no doubt also existed long before, perhaps as far back as the time when the rhapsode succeeded the bard. It was of the strongest, and the poems were jealously guarded (Suter, *Unfehlbarkeit. Homers*, 3, 7 ff.; cf. Friedländer, *Hom. Krit.* 21). This “deep reverential respect” (Agar, 239) may have been as old as the rhapsodes, and is against a class of reciters being able to manipulate the text. The bards were dear to the gods and esteemed by men. By historical times the rhapsodes were held in some contempt.<sup>1</sup> The contrary is not asserted of their predecessors. The status of wandering *jongleurs* would not be high. There are critics who think the rhapsodes were composers themselves. Christ, whose views are summarised by Jebb, believes that “Homerid rhapsodes” (a combination apparently intended *fidem facere*) could compose such splendid pieces as the *Hoplopoenia*, the story of Meleager, and the Doloneia. Then they were equal to the best, and it is difficult to believe that, in an age when

<sup>1</sup> For a parallel, see Jiriczek, 6. “The poetry was abandoned to utterly despised itinerant minstrels and jugglers.” Merovingian office of Minstrel to the Royal court became extinct; heroic

proprietary right in literary work was beginning to be recognised, they would compose for the benefit of some other poet or poem. "Tasteless rhapsodes" could also thrust their work in (Jebb, 128). That is still harder to believe. And why did not the *Ordner* purge the standard text of such inferior additions (*Jb.* 1890, 130 f.)? It is strange that there is no testimony in the scholia or elsewhere to this successful literary activity (Jevons, 53; Lehrs, *Ar.* 39 n.). We are referred to Cynaethus. But his burden is becoming greater than he can bear. He is Fick's transliterator. Living in a Dorian capital, he changed Aeolian songs into Ionic (*Jb.* 1887, 334). He is to Adam the *Hersteller* of the *Odyssey*, and the supporter of the Neleids who introduced Nestor. He is the "man of Chios" in the *Hym. Ap.*, though Thucydides and Aristophanes did not know it (*Ench.* xxxv.). He is the author of the spurious "Continuation" of the *Odyssey*. He is a rhapsodic Proteus of great potentiality. And for authority we have Eustathius and the scholia on Pindar, for which see Christ (*Zur Chron.* 50 ff.) and Wilamowitz (*H.U.* 259 and n.). The latter seems to regard Cynaethus as an inferior *Doppelgänger* of Pisistratus, and speaks of the scholia with anything but respect. This authority is also discussed by Dr. Monro (*Odyssey*, 400). He takes the popular view of the meaning of  $\pi\omega\lambda\alpha\tau\omega\nu\epsilon\pi\omega\nu$   $\pi\omega\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\tau\epsilon\nu\epsilon\mu\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\nu\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\eta\mu\eta\rho\mu\pi\omega\eta\sigma\iota\mu$ . But it seems incredible that the poems could be spoiled as late as near 500 B.C.—which would be after Pisistratus had settled the *Iliad* for all time (see Hennings in *Wocht. k. P.* 1910, 491). Volkmann (*Nachträge*, ii. 10) contests the interpretation. Gemoll (*Jb. Bursian*, 1888, 42) marvels that the words "could be so long misunderstood." Ludwich (*Homervulg.* 159 ff.) approves. He holds that, even admitting the popular interpretation, the scholia are not sufficient ground for the conclusion drawn.

But the rhapsode has an honoured place in Homeric criticism. K has suffered. Lentz (*Iterat.* 19) finds traces of a careless rhapsode in 396 ff., 409 ff., and 387. We think it is shewn in App. A that all are in place. Lentz gives no special reasons.  $\alpha\dot{\nu}\tau\dot{\circ}s\gamma\dot{\alpha}r\epsilon\phi\dot{\nu}\ell\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha\alpha\dot{\nu}\delta\rho\dot{\alpha}s$ . Almost anything may be ascribed to him. He is easily marked down.

But, it is said, there must be interpolations in the poems, for the Alexandrians marked spurious verses. If they had ever hinted who the trespassers were, the argument would have

more force. And they marked only about a thousand out of the 27,802 lines. What would they think of the depredations of their successors?  $\eta\ k\epsilon\ \mu\acute{e}g\ o\acute{i}\mu\acute{o}\xi\epsilon\iota\alpha\tau$ . And the Alexandrians' judgments can be and are frequently revised. Their atheteses are very often rejected. They went wrong about  $\acute{o}\mu\acute{i}\lambda\oslash$ ,  $\phi\acute{o}\beta\oslash$ , and  $o\acute{u}\rho\alpha\nu\oslash$  and  $a\acute{i}\theta\acute{\eta}\rho$ . We cannot wonder, for they had not Concordances or a Gehring's *Index* among the  $\acute{\nu}\pi\acute{o}\mu\acute{n}\acute{\mu}\alpha\tau\alpha$ . Who now accepts their judgments on  $\tau\acute{o}\ \acute{a}\pi\rho\acute{e}\pi\acute{e}\acute{s}$ ? In emendation van Herwerden says (*Herm.* xvi. 364) they were "leaden and not happy"; as to interpolation, only that they "often judged rightly." For Mr. Allen's view see *C.R.* xvii. 262, xx. 194, and xxi. 17. They were as apt as modern critics to solve difficulties by reference to the standards of their own day. As to  $o\acute{u}\delta\acute{e}\ \acute{e}\gamma\acute{r}\alpha\phi\acute{e}$  and  $o\acute{u}\kappa\ \acute{e}\phi\acute{e}\rho\acute{e}\tau\alpha$ , these are entitled to respect, but they do not contain the last word about a line.

For these reasons we hesitate to believe that there ever was much freedom to interpolate. It seems better to cherish a rigid scepticism on the point, and especially to refrain from deciding between *Ordner*, *Bearbeiter*, Rhapsode and common *Stümpfer*, till more accurate information about them is forthcoming. Every alleged intrusion must be judged on its merits and on principles consonant with common sense, and must be held to be genuine *donec probetur in contrarium*. As regards K, we believe it is accurate to say that none is proved. We may regard the lay as an "uncontaminated unit."

## CHAPTER IV

### EMENDATION

THE next question is how far the text represents the wording of the author of the lay. There seems to be but one passage which is hopelessly corrupt. For that see App. B, where I have ventured to supplement Dr. Leaf's amendment. But on what principles are we to proceed in restoring forms which have been altered or words which have been replaced by others? That is a thorny subject. Conservatives such as Ludwich protest against the excesses of Nauck and the Leyden editors and other Radicals. In Britain Dr. Leaf and Mr. Platt are at variance, and Mr. Agar's craving for uniformity does not please Mr. Allen.<sup>1</sup> It will take an age *tantas componere lites*. Our task, however, is a very limited one. Some of the critics' many objections to the language of K can be laid by small changes in the vulgate. It is therefore necessary for us to define once for all how far we are prepared to go in this direction.

That the text has suffered everybody knows. The transliteration into the new alphabet is generally accepted as one cause of degeneration, though some doubt, as Wilamowitz and Ludwich (Cauer, *Grdfrgn.* 115 ff.) and Jebb. Alterations due to the repeated copying of the MSS. are admitted by all. The "sleepy scribe" has no doubt much to answer for. Modern philology, helped by the hexameter, exposes his mistakes, for which see Molhuysen's *De tribus Hom. Od. codd.* Some would be due to inadvertence, *γραφικὰ ἀμαρτήματα*. In all cases "the tendency of corruption would be towards the more familiar" (Leaf on B 36). And see *H.G.* 19 n., Mr. Agar's *Homerica*, and Dr

<sup>1</sup> Preface to Platt's *Odyssey*, and *C.Q.* ii. 227. On the whole question see Wecklein's *Textkrit.*, *passim*, and concluding words.

Monro's *Odyssey*, 476. There would be general "modernisation."<sup>1</sup> Older forms and words would give place to others current later.

The Doloneia has suffered the common lot. But it has not had fair treatment. Its linguistic "peculiarities" are mostly held to be solecisms and to indicate a bad, late poet. Mr. Agar (*Homerica*, 125 f.) would not charge such lapses to the poet at all, but to copyists or modernisers. The critics, to reverse a remark of Baumeister's, *poetam castigant ubi librarii sunt castigandi*. Where a trifling change removes the objection, we need not hesitate to amend. The Leyden editors say, in the preface to their *Iliad*, that the most cautious editors do not refrain from conjecture. It is also true, as Pierron says, that *les corrections n'obligent personne*; they must be judged on their merits. We shall confine ourselves to changes small and philologically reasonable, such as we think even the most conservative editors will endorse. Arbitrary amendments, the products of divination, and too often resorted to as a way out of a difficulty, are banned. In such cases, especially where there is much inversion of the order of the words, we hesitate. For example, A 88 f. See Leaf on its "three sins," and the way to rewrite the passage. The wording must be made to conform to certain notions. Mr. Agar (*op. cit.* 283 f.) condones one sin and apparently would not object to another. Or take a case nearer home. Dūntzer proposed, in K 105 ff., to leave out 107 and in 106 to read ἡέ περ ἥμας for εἴ κεν Ἀχιλλεύς. The remedy is worse than the suspected disease. The passage is intelligible as it stands. See p. 157 *infra*. Such a proposal not only binds no one; it commands no respect.

Some examples will shew how limited the licence we claim is. Prepositions were frequently confused,—Cobet, *M.C.* 398 f., and the commentaries *passim*. The same may be said of particles. ἀν was often wrongly inserted. γάρ replaced δέ. *Saepe librarii copulas inferserunt*. Similarity of letters caused mistakes. See Leaf on N 644, as to ξ and ξ. Epithets were interchanged, ἀσπετα and ἀγλαά, ἄριστοι and ἀγνητοί, etc., and other words of the same meaning and metrical value, as κότος and χόλος, ὅπαζει, ἐπείγει, and ικάνει, παρεών and περ ἔων, and so on. Phrases also

<sup>1</sup> Hennings (reviewing Fick's *Entstg. d. Od.* in *Wocht. k. P.* 1910, 483) expresses a different view. "The epic language (in spite of Bentley, Monro, Agar, and Fick) mocks all efforts to prove modern-  
isation." He thinks reverence for the text protected it. It did so, no doubt, against changes of the substance of the poems.

dislodged each other. Words recur in the same position in the verse, and a careless copyist familiar with them there, often inserted them wrongly. The desire to cure hiatus was a frequent cause of change,<sup>1</sup> and ignorance of the Digamma another. Particles were put in and forms or even whole words altered to cure apparent defects. See *H.G.* 362, on “corruption arising from the tendency to repair defects of metre.” In such cases critics of all shades of opinion correct freely. And they can claim that their diagnosis has been confirmed at times by the discovery of new MSS. Instances are given by the Leyden editors in the preface to their *Iliad*. Barnes’ *οὐτιδανοῖσιν*, σ 383, is a familiar case. Another is Ruhnken’s *βεβρυχνία*, Hes. *Scut.* 160. So also, on K 493, *vulg. νεκροῖς ἀμβαίνοντες*, Orszulik notes that this verb has the dat. only there, adding the not very relevant remark that elsewhere *στείβειν νέκνας* is used. *ἐμβαίνοντες* was conjectured by Cobet, and now has MS. support. Dr. Leaf, *a.l.*, compares Z 65 and κ 164. So with Cobet’s *τάρ* for *γάρ*, K 61. See Leaf, *a.l.*, and on A 8. But *γάρ* is as good, both there and in 424, *πῶς γάρ νῦν*:

For K, the cases in which acceptable emendation removes difficulties are summarised in App. C.

<sup>1</sup> It was often, according to the general view, licit. See Leaf on M 101, quoting Ahrens, and on II 57 as to the well-known case of *εὐτείχεον*. Cf. notes on E 898, Δ 242 on such “fictions” as *ἥσθας* and *ἔλεγχέες*. Also Bechtel in *Hermes*, xxxix. 155 f.; S. and A. on

*Hym. Ap.* 341; *Ench.* 77; Cauer, Pref. to *Od.* xxii., and reviewing Nauck in *Jb.* 1884, 326. But see Agar, *passim*, for a new view. He certainly has an enormous amount of authority against him.

## CHAPTER V

### THE LINGUISTIC ATTACK

THE linguistic evidence of the spuriousness of K is extremely plentiful. There are few lines in the lay that have not yielded something verbally amiss. The case is formidable, if bulk alone be considered. But we take comfort from the old adage, *testimonia ponderanda, non numeranda*. If the items or most of them are individually negligible, we need not fear the effect of the sum total. But it is unfortunate that the very number of the counts in the indictment has satisfied so many of the enemies of K, and deterred its friends from clearing its character. It got a bad name in early days. Some "ancients," as we shall see, affixed a stigma to the lay; and when a book or a passage comes under suspicion, it is easy to find solecisms in its language to complete the case against it. For these abound everywhere in the poems, even in the *Mēnis* itself. For the Doloneia, these aberrations are held to be overwhelming and fatal, and to prove its lateness "unmistakably." Professor Henry's dictum (*C.R.* xx. 97) that the verdict of the philologists is "unequivocal" is hardly to be controverted.

The first statement of the linguistic sins in K was made by Adolf Holm in 1853, in his essay *Ad Car. Lachmanni exemplum de aliquot Il. carm. compositione*. More than half of it is devoted to ὄπλα in the sense of "arms." The other occurrences of the word in this sense are in "late" passages. Therefore K, which uses it in this sense, is late. A few other words and expressions are specified. G. Curtius (*Andeutgn.* 43) found Holm's enumeration "excellent." The essay might not of itself have had much effect. A blow from Curtius was a more serious matter.

Bernhardy followed with a statement (*H.G.L.* 163 f.) not much more full than Holm's, whose attack was developed by

Düntzer in *Philologus*, xii. 41 ff., now pp. 303 ff. of his *Hom. Abh.* Düntzer ridiculed his predecessor's effort as relying on "a few ἄπαξ εἰρημένα." Nor did he share Curtius' admiration for the argument from ὅπλα. His own list is considerable. Yet it is hardly more serious than could be drawn up in an hour or two for almost any other book in either poem. It included evidence of the affinity of K with the *Odyssey*. But the proof is meagre. And of course there is affinity with the *Odyssey*. Every book of the *Iliad* exhibits it. It is, as we shall see, writ large on A, which to most critics is of hoary age. If Düntzer had shewn that words and expressions which recur only in the *Odyssey* abound in K, there might have been weight in his proof. But he enumerates only a poor dozen, none of them except φῆμις of any importance, with two verbs used in the mid. in K and the *Odyssey*. The demonstration, however, was commended by Christ. The praise was somewhat easily earned. As a matter of fact, "few books in the *Iliad* have so small a number of Odyssean words as the Doloneia, and this is the more remarkable from the fact that Odysseus is one of its leading characters." For the proof see *C.P.* v. 41 ff.

But Düntzer's statement is insignificant compared with the long catalogue compiled by K. Orszulik in 1883. This, as the fullest statement that has yet appeared, and that probably ever will appear, is the one I take as my text, so it is necessary to say a few words descriptive of its scheme.<sup>1</sup> The peculiarities are classed as (1) ἄπαξ εἰρημένα; (2) strange meanings; (3) singular forms; (4) remarkable combinations of words, and (5) unusual constructions; to which are added (6) borrowed verses and parts of verses, and (7) remarks on the versification and style. For the last two categories see Chaps. XIV. and XIII., *infra*. As regards the first five, the words and expressions in every one of them are further subdivided according as they are found (a) only in K, (b) only in K and the *Odyssey*, (c) in K and oftener in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*, or (d) only in K and in the "later" parts of the *Iliad* or in the *Odyssey*, or in both. It is a great onslaught, and

<sup>1</sup> I have endeavoured to notice all linguistic objections from every source, except those which are quite trifling or which have been answered by the objectors themselves. There are lists in Monro's and Leaf's editions of the *Iliad*. See also *H.G.*, Index, "Iliad,

characteristics of certain books"; van Herwerden, *Q.H.* 130 f.; Christ, *Hom. od. Homdn.* 61, 62 and n., and 99 ff.; Bechtel, *Vocalcontr.* 3 f.; Jebb, 123 n., etc. For the solecisms detected by Fick, and called by him *Verstöße gegen die epische Aeolis*, see his *Iliad*, 479 f.

almost unique in Homeric criticism. But one should sow with the hand, not with the sack. Surely no Homerid's work could ever have exhibited so many deviations from the traditional epic language. And how does Orszulik's statement consist with the charge that the author of K was a late *imitative* poet?

On one point, however, we must take objection. For the purpose of his classification, it was of course necessary for Orszulik to set out his distribution of the books of the *Iliad* according to assumed date of origin, and this is done on pp. 19 ff. of his work. It is enough to say of it that it is almost impossible that it can commend itself in its entirety to any other Homerist. See Rothe's remarks on it in *Jb. Bursian*, 1885, 211. *Quot critici*—nearly so many are the views as to the limits of the early, somewhat late, late, and very late strata; and until the critics agree on a delimitation, it is futile to consider any such comparison as Orszulik makes of K with the *Ur-Ilias* and other parts of the *Iliad*. In effect he asks us to look on words or phrases which do not occur in that ancient and select piece of Homeric poetry as more or less tainted. But that is unreasonable. The *Ur-Ilias* is not a thesaurus of the epic language. The Lay of the Wrath is, even in its dimensions as assigned by the most liberal of the upholders of the kernel theory, of but small compass. If the *Ur-Ilias* be made long enough, we shall have no difficulty in vindicating the Doloneia.

And we observe that the critics generally appeal with perfect impartiality to any part of the poems in which they can find support, and are far from feeling bound to quote precedent or find analogy within the limits, the ever fluctuating and much debated limits, of the *Ur-Ilias*. Their very latest parts of the poems are pressed into service on such occasions. If a writer wants to reconstruct the *Ναύσταθμος* or to make a map of the *Schauplatz* of the *Iliad*, he refers to K. Were there then maps and plans extant down to the latest generation of interpolators? On H 12 Dr. Leaf can refer to line 30 of K, a book which is to him the work of a poet of 650 B.C., as authority about the *στεφάνη*.<sup>1</sup> On Δ 277 he quotes K 437 against Hentze's objection that a certain phrase is "un-Homeric." Dr. Monro on ω 426 relies on K 52 as proving that the double accus. with *μήσατο* is "Homeric."

<sup>1</sup> Though Robert (p. 50) thinks the author of K was a *Spätlings* who did not understand what he was talking about.

This word "Homeric" makes much mischief. It is a sort of standard to many Dissectors. "Homer" used as an equivalent for "the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*," as Jebb in his handbook professes to use it, is unobjectionable. It is a convenient abbreviation. And if "Homeric" could be used in the same way to mean anything that is found or can be paralleled in the poems, it would be equally harmless. But it is often used in a very different way. Individual critics may have a definite idea themselves of what they mean by the "Homeric spirit," the "Homeric tone of mind," "Homeric Greece," "the Homeric Age," and the like; but when they are authorities to whom "Homer" spreads himself through centuries, readers have difficulty in following them. And negatively, this use of the word has become a simple way of affixing the stigma of ungenuineness to anything in the poems which it is desired to proscribe. It is said that the thing is "not Homeric." One cannot read a few pages of a commentary without noticing this looseness of expression. We can understand Dr. Leaf's note on B 409, that *ἀδελφεός* is "the only Homeric form." It is the only one that occurs in the two poems. But we do not understand Dr. Monro's note on τ 34, that "the synizesis of *χρύσεον* is not Homeric." See Z 220, etc. Synizesis is everywhere, in *Iliad* and *Odyssey* alike. We have *ἄφρεον* in the *Ur-Ilias* itself, Λ 282. Again, Dr. Leaf says of the similes in B 455-83 that they are "vivid and Homeric." The meaning appears to be that to his taste they are good, worthy of the poet of the kernel, or perhaps of the undefined period known as "the bloom of the epic." This is really a popular use of the term. For some, no doubt, as Jebb says, it has "a clear meaning." But as that meaning depends on the appreciation of the individual, the word is unsuitable for use in a critical treatise. What is or is not worthy of the best of the contributory poets is matter of taste, and tastes on such points differ to a most remarkable extent. What, for instance, could be more widely different than Professor Murray's and Professor Henry's opinions of the Doloneia as epic poetry? To some—see Christ, *Hom. od. Homdn.* 28 f.—there is "a marked decline of poetical power" in the last six books of the *Iliad*. The judgment astounds others. Christ himself ranks X among the best books of that poem, and quotes O. Müller's high appreciation of the scene between Achilles and Priam in Ω, and Schiller's well-known

eulogy of Ψ. Shelley wrote of the “perpetually increasing magnificence of the last seven books” of the *Iliad*. “The *Odyssey* is sweet, but there is nothing like this.”<sup>1</sup> Compare again the opinions of Dr. Leaf (*Introduction to Φ*) and Professor Murray (*H.G.E.* 242) on the *Theomachy*. They partly agree, but whereas one thinks the piece is “poverty-stricken in expression,” the other finds it “admirably written.” The taste of individuals is evidently not to be trusted. “What one critic thinks splendid, another equally competent thinks poor and tame” (Mahaffy in *Macm. Mag.* xxxviii. 408). “Nothing is rarer than a sure aesthetic judgment” (Erhardt, *Entstg.* xix). We recall the story of the “tedious poem on the Fall of Man” by “the old blind schoolmaster, John Milton.” Yet Dissectors rely freely on their own personal predilections to ascribe work that does not please them to a *Stümper*. They, as Rothe expresses it (*Jb.* 1890, 133), “conceive for themselves an *Idealhomer*, and expunge mercilessly everything that does not correspond to this ideal.” The “Homeric” standard is practically useless. Holm (*Hist. Gr.*, Eng. transl., i. 165) thinks that some day “we shall be able to agree as to what is really Homeric in spirit.” That may be doubted. For the present it is certain that the “Homeric” is an ideal that every one must interpret in his own way, and not of the nature of a well-defined norm to which adherence can be secured.

But to return to linguistic phenomena. How are we to estimate these? The only feasible plan, till the late and the early parts of the poems have been fixed beyond dispute—and that will take some time yet—is to follow the old rule, “Ομηρον οὐκ ἀλλοθέν ποθεν, ἀλλ’ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ποιήσεως ἐλέγχειν. *Unum solumque Homerum attendamus* (Lehrs, *Ar.* 50). *Homerum ex Homero, pauca necesse est ex plerisque judicemus* (Bäumlein, *Commentat.* 27). Cf. *Ench.* lxxi. This is the procedure that Mr. Agar insists on in his *Homeric*. “Make appeal to Homer himself.” “Let Homer vouch for his own usage.” He frequently quotes K as authority for epic usage, though he says, yielding for a moment to the prevailing feeling, that it “is not always a very safe authority for diction” (p. 113). If K, which is so late in general opinion, can be appealed to, so may it in turn appeal to other parts of the poems. We must utilise all, and see how

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Butler, *Authoress of the Odyssey*, 106.

much conformity to or variation from τὸ ἔθιμον τοῦ ποιητοῦ, as the men of old said, τῆς ποίησεως, as we must say, is displayed by K, and come to conclusions as best we may, after examining the grounds which objectors adduce. In estimating the peculiarities in the mass, we shall compare them with those to be found in A, which is admittedly old and genuine poetry.

The concluding words of the last sentence might have been written a few years ago without any qualification. Now a word must be added. Until comparatively recently there has been, to the great body of Dissectors, a *Mēnis* or *Ur-Ilias*, to which we may say that books A, Λ, X and some other parts of the *Iliad* belonged. There has been, of course, great diversity of opinion as to the precise limits of this "primary *Iliad*," and much agreement that it has been altered and interpolated. But it was regarded as the nucleus, and consequently the most ancient part of the great poem. And A has always been accorded special reverence. σεμνὸν ἔπεστι τι. References are surely superfluous, but I may quote Bergk, 540, 553; Düntzer, *H.A.* 180 ff.; Sittl, *H.G.L.* 86 f.; Jebb, 157; Browne, 104; Christ, *Hom. od. Homdn.* 28 n.; Kammer, *Ästh. Komm.* 129; and Friedländer, *Hom. Krit.* 29 and *Anh.* i. Opinion has been practically, as Bechtel puts it (*Vocalcontr.* ix.), unanimous that A is of the very oldest and best.

But it is now a good many years since this pre-eminence was challenged by Wilamowitz (see *Jb.* 1909, 224, and Cauer, *Grdfrgn.* 304 n.), who expressed the opinion that the critics erred in taking A as the point of departure for analysis of the *Iliad*. But he failed to attract attention. Now a new generation of analysers is following the line thus indicated, and a novel turn has been given to dissection. Finsler (597 ff.) affirms that there never was an *Ur-Ilias*. Wecklein (*Stud.* iii), imbued with the belief that the final solution of the problem of the *Iliad* must be sought in a compromise between extreme views, has propounded the theory that Achilles belongs, to the Aeolian saga indeed, but to Ionian poetry (*ibid.* 51). First there was an *Iliad*. Then came the Master with the *Wrath* and converted that *Iliad* into an *Achilleid* (p. 56). The *Achilleid* is and has always been in Ionic; Fick's *Aeolismus* is not required. So Mülder (*Altion.* 18), —the original *Iliad* consisted of B-Θ and K-M. The whirligig of criticism brings its revenges. Θ and K, the poor cento

and the despised interloper that Pisistratus befriended, are after all made earlier than protozoic A. The methods of Wecklein and Mülder have been severely dealt with in *Jb.* 1907, 294 ff.; cf. 1905, 179 f. But the new idea is approved by Professor Murray (*H.G.E.* 168 f.). The *Wrath* was "an old traditional motive," and was employed by the poet who made the *Ilias* or "poetry about Troy," to join together and make fairly consistent a mass of "diverse traditions of heroic fighting." We are told (p. 210) that the subject of the *Wrath*, which was used in this way, and which has been the theme of unrestrained eulogy, is second-rate, and that Achilles is not an altogether satisfactory hero—opinions on which see Mr. Lang in *Blackwood's Mag.* 1908, 87. Bethe also takes the premiership from the object of our old hero-worship. It is Aias, fighting from Rhoeteum, who was the original hero of the Trojan lays. Professor Murray (p. 169) points out that  $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu \ \ddot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu \ \Delta\alpha\nu\hat{\omega}\nu \ \mu\epsilon\tau' \ \dot{\alpha}\mu\mu\mu\omega\nu$  Πηλείωνα, P 280, λ 470, 551, and ω 18, is an "inorganic line," with which one may do what one pleases. But many will think that these passages read better *with* the inorganic line, and will not entertain the idea that, because it can be cut out, therefore it must have been inserted. That is one of the extreme assumptions of the Dissecting school, a bad specimen of a class that Ludwich's *Möglichkeit ist nicht Notwendigkeit* is always a sufficient reply to. The line, or rather its way of putting the point, is not confined to Achilles. Have θ 117, II 195, and P 351 also been inserted? Girard (*Rev. d. Études Grecques*, 1902, 245, 249, 286) takes a similar view. There were many Quarrels. It was "a theme the bards loved." They used no fewer than eleven Quarrels of one kind and another. There were other *Iliads* before our *Iliad*, and Achilles may have figured in them.

All this is directly subversive of ideas on the origin of the *Iliad* that have been almost universally popular, and the Expansionists will ask for more proof before they strike their colours. At present there seems to be but little. And even if there were something in the new theories to invite attention, there would be nothing in them that need disturb us here. If the parts of the *Iliad* outside the *Menis* are ancient, so much the better. As to the *Menis* itself, we have still a great preponderance of expert opinion in favour of its age, and even

the Neo-Homerists who are advocating the new view would not all style it modern. Rothe is not troubled by these novelties (*Jb.* 1909, 223 f.). He has always held that the poet who made the *Iliad* had a mass of old materials to work up. The *Iliad* is none the less his own original composition. But we are concerned here only with the question of a standard of reference on philological points, and it is clear that we are, more than ever, justified in referring freely for analogy or precedent to any part of the *Iliad*.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE *ILIADE* AND THE *ODYSSEY*—ALLEGED DIFFERENCE OF LANGUAGE

WE have seen in Chap. V. that certain linguistic idiosyncrasies are said to dissociate K from the *Iliad* and to attach it to the *Odyssey*. As, then, the *Odyssey* is believed to be later than the bulk of the *Iliad*, and it is argued that K must be the same, it is worth our while to examine, in the first instance, the linguistic proof as between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as wholes, to see if a difference is traceable which justifies the proposition that the two poems belong to different ages. As we think the finding must be in the negative, we shall venture to take the language as essentially one. We shall examine the lists of Düntzer and Orszulik all the same, but our enquiry will be narrowed to an endeavour to prove that the language of K does not differ essentially from that of the other forty-seven books, without accepting these as differentiated into an earlier and a later group.

The view that the two poems are not by the same author or of the same age is not universal, as Croiset (*Rev. d. d. Mondes*, 1907, 615) would have us believe, but it may be said to be held at present by the majority of scholars. But here again there is great diversity. Some think the two ages were far apart. Others take a much more moderate view.<sup>1</sup> If they are some of them inclined to the Chorizontic belief, they are not all satisfied with the conclusiveness of the evidence. They

<sup>1</sup> Among these may be quoted Nitzsch, *Sagenp.* 293 f.; Grote, ii. 131 ff.; Friedländer, *Die hom. Krit.* 70; Christ, *Hom. od. Homdn.* 8 ff., 65, *Interpol.* 186, *Zur Chronolog.* 60, and H.G.L.<sup>4</sup> 43; Mahaffy, *Macm. Mag.* xxxviii. 408; Gemoll, *Hom. Blät.* ii. 3; Sitzler, *Asth. Komm. z. Od.*<sup>3</sup> 257; Platt, *J. Phil.* xviii. 127; Drerup, *Homer*, 109, 132; Strickland, *Ia Quest. Omerica*, 96; and Mülder, *Quellen*, 354.

recognise the great force of the extraordinary likeness between the two poems in language, style, verse, and other respects. Mr. Platt (*l.c.*) holds that "in most points the language of the older *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is almost identical." Some accept different authorship, but not different ages. Others consider that the interval between the poems was short, and can even reduce it to a generation. So Professor Mackail (*Progs. Class. Assocn.* 1908, 9), though he admits the possibility that both poems were written by one man. A difference of only a generation must be hard to perceive. It could scarcely be reflected in the language.

The Chorizontic theory is one which seems to have won a hearing by its very attractiveness for some minds, for most of the attempted proofs have been short and sketchy. A few words occurring in only one of the poems are given, some stock instances of variation in mythology, geography and the like are quoted, and difference in date or authorship is affirmed. But this cannot be said of the latest demonstration. Dr. Monro (*Odyssey*, App. II., *Relation of the Odyssey to the Iliad*, 3 and 4) has collected the linguistic evidence in a systematic and comprehensive manner. We propose to consider this presentation of it in detail. The evidence from *Realien* is beyond our scope, and it does not seem necessary to go into it. Its essentially trivial character has been sufficiently exposed by Colonel Mure, M. Terret, Professor Jevons and Mr. Lang, and more recently by Miss Stawell.

Dr. Monro deals with *Grammar* and *Vocabulary*. I had examined all the items which he mentions under each head before *Homer and the Iliad* appeared. Miss Stawell has there discussed the vocabulary in a general way on pp. 105-8, which contain some valuable points admirably put, but as particulars are not given, I summarise my own results in detail in App. E. It may be useful, in considering Dr. Monro's lists, to see actual numbers of occurrences, and, in many cases, the connection in which a word appears. It is remarkable in how many cases an explanation of the occurrence of a word in only the one poem or the other is forthcoming; there are not many about which nothing can be said. Miss Stawell's refutation of the grammatical case may, I think, be accepted almost without demur, so far as it concerns the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey as wholes*. I therefore

content myself with supplementing her statement on certain points, and this is done in App. D. Here I add some remarks on the results of the discussions in both Appendices.

The first is that Dr. Monro, for the purpose of his comparison, takes the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to be two homogeneous units. But he holds that certain parts of the *Iliad*, especially I, K, Ψ, and Ω, are, on the evidence of points in the language which are collected in the *H.G.*, of a distinctly Odyssean character. They make up, one might say, about a quarter of the poem. It has accordingly been suggested (*C.Q.* iv. 76) that the comparison should have been between the remaining three-quarters of the *Iliad*, and the *Odyssey* plus the Odyssean quarter of the *Iliad*. The method which Dr. Monro has adopted seems to be inconsistent with his own position, that a considerable area of the *Iliad* is connected by language with the *Odyssey*. We shall have occasion to point out that many of the words, etc., which he claims as foreign to the *Iliad* and peculiar to the *Odyssey*, are not found in the Odyssean tracts of the *Iliad*. They form no inconsiderable aggregate, and they tell strongly, if there is anything in his method, against the special character which he and others seek to assign to these Odyssean books.

He naturally commences his examination of the vocabulary with the admission, that the general difference between the two poems in subject accounts in great measure for the occurrence of words in one poem and not in the other. The *Iliad* "was sure to be rich in terms for fighting and its incidents,"<sup>1</sup> the *Odyssey* in words for sea, ships, islands, etc., and for objects of ease and luxury." For an excellent statement of the differences in scene, action, and actors, see Mure, ii. 131, and cf. 163. See also Gladstone, *Primer of Homer*, 28 f.; Blass, *Interpol.* 291 f.; and Muff, *Zauber der hom. Poesie*, 7 f. The *Iliad* "is all action, the *Odyssey* is more quiet and meditative" (Rouse, Introd. to M. Arnold's *On translg. Hom.* 16). We may add Aristotle's dictum (*Poetics*, 1459 b) that the subject of the *Iliad* is ἀπλοῦν καὶ παθητικόν, that of the *Odyssey* πεπλευμένον καὶ ἡθικόν, with Professor Bywater's note on the last word, "a characteristic noted by Longinus, as shewing the *Odyssey* to have been the work of

<sup>1</sup> If one wishes to see to what extent compared with the *Odyssey*, reference may be made to Hoch's *Lexikal. Bemerkgn.* E.g., out of 32 epithets of μάχη and πόλεμος, only six occur, and those very rarely, in the *Odyssey*.

Homer's later years,"—γῆρας δ' ὅμως 'Ομήρου. We must be prepared to find a very great difference between the classes of words employed in the two epics.

Individual cases in Apps. D and E illustrate this over and over again. It will be seen that some of the Odyssean usages can be explained by reference to the position of Odysseus, the anxiety of his friends, and their speculations as to the prospects of his return, and others by the presence in the *Odyssey* of the riotous crew of Wooers. The formulae, stereotyped expressions used in or to describe certain situations, must differ widely in two poems of such diverse kinds. ὡς εἰπὼν ὥτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἔκάστου is found *Il.* 10, *Od.* 1. The explanation is obvious. The occurrences in the *Iliad* are all in battle-scenes; a god or a chief encourages the warriors. Principal Geddes (*Problem*, p. v.) lays stress on διαπρύσιον, which occurs only in the *Iliad*. Of its seven occurrences, six are in the line ἦντεν δὲ διαπρύσιον, Δαναοῖσι γεγωνώς. Would anyone expect to find that formula in the *Odyssey*? So as to ἔξῆς, seven times in the *Odyssey*, and not in the *Iliad*. It occurs six times in the formula ἔξῆς δ' ἔζόμενοι πολιὴν ἄλα τύπτον ἐρετμοῖς, for the use of which in the *Iliad* the opportunities are all but—in view of A 433, 479, I might, I think, say absolutely—non-existent. So as to the epithets. Dr. Monro includes in his list of words confined to the *Iliad*, some designations of gods and heroes who appear only or almost exclusively in that poem. They prove nothing. Or take a case in which the *Iliad* is supposed to favour one form of an epithet and the *Odyssey* another, ἐρίγδουπος and ἐρίδουπος. A glance at the occurrences of the two words in the Concordances is sufficient to explain their distribution; there is more of Zeus in the *Iliad*, more of the πρόθυρον in the *Odyssey*. Payne Knight argued an advance in music from κόλλοψ. On his reasoning see Mure, ii. 161 n. πομπή is one of the abstracta that the *Odyssey* is supposed to favour. It occurs there twenty-five times (in the books ε—ν, and we can see the reason). Fortunately the *Iliad* shews its knowledge of it by using it once. The word τάφρος is frequent in the *Iliad*, of the fosse; in the *Odyssey* it occurs but once, in the great Trial of the Bow. Had the dénouement of the *Odyssey* been differently contrived, or had the poet of the *Iliad* represented the Achaeans as taking some other precautions when Achilles retired, we should have had another

Chorizontic argument from vocabulary. On such an unstable basis is the reasoning founded.

As regards the grammatical section of the indictment there is one remark to be made. A usage is said to be peculiar to one of the poems. It would make the case very much stronger, if an alternative usage could be indicated in the other. But this is seldom done. The non-occurrence of, say, a preposition with a certain case, or of a certain conjunctional use, may be due to many causes besides the one suggested, that the poet did not know or was not familiar with it.

And there are other considerations of a more general nature. The similes in the poems are often taken from the everyday occupations and pleasures of the people, and so afford us glimpses of a life which but rarely comes within the scope of the general narratives of the epics. It is not strange then that they often present us with words which occur nowhere else. Friedländer (*Zw. h. W.* 749) recognises that the similes are "the richest source" of the *ἀ. λλ.* in the poems. Now similes are much more frequent in the *Iliad* than in the *Odyssey*. Friedländer (786 ff.) enumerates 217 in the former and only 58 in the latter. The reasons for this are well ascertained (Jebb, 29; Mure, i. 260; Jäger, *Hom. Aph.* 210. See also Cauer, *Grdfrgn.* 420). But the point is that the disparity in numbers should be reflected by the *ἀ. λλ.*, and this is just what we find. There are three *ἀ. λλ.* in the *Iliad* for every one in the *Odyssey*. Here is an explanation of the peculiar distribution of words which are sometimes cited.

Again, there is much more direct speech in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*. The lines in the latter which are spoken by the gods and heroes introduced, number, according to my counting,<sup>1</sup> about 7000; in the *Odyssey* they are about 8240. Allowing for the smaller compass of the *Odyssey*, it will be found there are about three lines in the *Odyssey* put into the mouths of the *dramatis personae* for every two in the *Iliad*. This must have its effect on both vocabulary and grammar. The inflections of verbs, for instance, are different. That will affect the hexameters in which they are used, and the choice of words and phrases for them. It will tend to cause recourse to new formulae and alternative epithets. As an illustration,—the

<sup>1</sup> Which differs somewhat from the figures given by Elderkin in *Aspects of Speech in the later Greek Epic*, 2.

*Odyssey* is said to have a larger number of certain optatives in the first person. These can appear only in speeches. To compare the occurrences properly with those in the *Iliad*, we must bear in mind that more are to be expected in the *Odyssey*. Miss Stawell has noted this difference, and has shewn in several other instances how it tells.

And the effect of the repetition which is so marked a characteristic of the epic style, must be to enhance such difference as other circumstances produce. If, owing to difference of subject, certain words and phrases are more appropriate in the one poem or the other, the repetition of these, *more Homeric*, over and over again, must cause the difference in vocabulary and diction generally to appear greater than it really is. How much effect this repetition has may be seen from many of the individual cases in the lists.

Dr. Monro seems to go too far in his disregard of what seems to be the general view, that much weight is not to be attached to differences of vocabulary. See, e.g., Jevons, 27; M. and R. on θ 267; and the considerations urged in Chap. VII. *infra*. And some of his inferences may be neutralised. Thus he thinks that archaic epithets are more characteristic of the (to him) older poem. It is, however, worth noting that there are a number of these “old poetical” words preserved in “fixed or traditional combinations,” which are known to the *Odyssey* only,—δασπλῆτις, ἀγρονόμοι, τερψίμβροτος, φαεσίμβροτος (once in Ω), χρυσόρραπις, χρυσοπέδιλος, ἄγνή, ἀγάστονος, ἐύσκοπος (twice in Ω). And all these except ἀγάστονος are applied to divinities who are frequently named in the *Iliad*. And besides the divine epithets we have others confined to the *Odyssey*, ἐυπλοκαμῖδες, εὐδειέλος, κάμμορος, ταλαπείριος, τηῦσίην (όδόν), διερός, ἀλφηστής, and a large number appropriate to the seafaring life of the *Odyssey*, which might be set against Dr. Monro’s collection of archaic epithets of a martial character in the *Iliad*. We might add the adverb ἥλιθα (once also in the “Odyssean” story in the end of Λ), the verbs πεμπάζομαι and ἔεσσα, and the noun ὑπαρ, to balance the few words other than epithets which he specifies. It does not appear that anything as to age and authorship is to be argued on his archaic words. That some were not used in the *Odyssey* is not because it was composed so long after the *Iliad* that the words had died out.

Many persisted and were used in the Hymns, Hesiod, Pindar and the Tragedians. A perusal of the lists of epithets will satisfy any one that this is the case. And so for other words, *εἰθαρ*, *τίνη*, *διαπρύσιον*, etc. Mure (ii. 163) goes so far as to affirm that "the result of an impartial scrutiny leaves a decided balance of such phraseology on the side of the *Odyssey*."

Dr. Monro, following other writers, finds in the *Odyssey* an increase in "words expressing moral and intellectual qualities." Jebb (p. 55) marks in it "more traces of reflection on questions of right and wrong. There are some additions to the stock of words for expressing the religious or moral feelings." A very scanty list is given. The subject of the *Odyssey*, a triumph of righteousness (Geddes, *Problem*, 328 ff.), might by itself entitle us to contemplate even a far greater development without any surprise. Similarly Bernhardy (*H.G.L.* 179 f.) notes the "rich gnomology" in the *Odyssey*, and takes this as indicating an "age of reflection." His quotation of the splendid instance in σ 131 f. is unfortunate. There are critics who regard P 446 f. as the text from which those lines are borrowed. But, however that may be, the sentiment is in the *Iliad*. And there are many others there, but just shewing the difference in kind and amount which the subject would lead us to expect. Warriors do not moralise on the battle-field to the same extent, or with the same intent, or in the same terms as a sage or a seer in the halls of a chief or among a crowd of reckless revellers.

This development of the ethical vocabulary is supposed to correspond to a more advanced religion and a more elevated moral tone. But these are not discernible. The "fluid state of myths and legends" in early days has to be reckoned with (Jevons, 26, and *H. and A.* 233 f.). Mure (ii. 147 ff.) has shewn that there is not a higher conception of the gods in the *Odyssey*, and Terret and others find the same morality in both poems. Morals may have improved in the supposed interval between them, but there is certainly nothing so bad in the *Iliad* as the fiendish treatment of Melanthios in χ 475 ff. If "expurgation" was an active, ever-working influence, this horror is inexplicable. Professor Lewis Campbell (*Relig. in Gk. Lit.* 80, 99) finds the vocabulary of right and wrong only "somewhat enlarged" in the *Odyssey*. The obvious explanation is "the nature of the poem." He observes that the ethical vocabulary

of the epic is imperfect all over. Unequal distribution of the terms that constitute it was to be expected. We might compile a list peculiar to the *Iliad*, as ἀήσυλος, αἴσιος, ἀσύφηλος, παραισιος, εὐφημέω and ἐπευφημέω, μαχλοσύνη, φιλοφροσύνη, ἀλιτήμων, ἄσκοπος, ἄκοσμος, φιλοψευδής, and the like. We might add that ξάθεος occurs *Il.* 7, *Od.* 0, and the words ἀρητήρ, ιέρευς, ιέρεια, *Il.* 12, *Od.* 1, the one occurrence in the *Odyssey* being in what high authorities have deemed a late addition. But all such lists are a weak basis for argument.

Their fallaciousness is illustrated by another branch of Dr. Monro's statement. He finds advance of civilisation in the *Odyssey*. If we depend on vocabulary alone, it is not difficult to adduce as much ground for inferring retrogression. It might be contended that there is more specialisation of trades, more division of labour in the *Iliad*, as shewn by the terms ἄρματοπηγός (ἀνήρ), κεραμεύς, κεραοξόος τέκτων, ὁχετηγός, δρυτόμος, σκυτοτόμος (in § 23 Eumaeus is his own shoemaker). It is only from the *Iliad* that we know the process of tanning. Add to the list such words as χερνῆτις, μετανάστης, ἵστωρ, ἔεδνωται, δημογέροντες, βουλευτής (*Βουληφόρος*, *Il.* 15, *Od.* 2), and κασσίτερος, *Il.* 10, *Od.* 0. Many others might be cited from the earlier poem tending to the same conclusion, as ἄδυτον, τιθήνη, φέρτρον, ἀμαξιτός, λαοφόρος ὁδός, δῆμος, στρόμβος, σάλπιγξ, ἔνρον, πίσσα, πῖλος, ἀεθλοφόρος ἵππος, ἀμείβοντες (*tigna culminis*), ἴστοδόκη, ἄφλαστον, ἑκατόζυγος (*vην̄s*), ἐπταπόδης θρῆνυς, etc. I feel certain that if we were to take the trouble to extract from the similes and other passages of the *Iliad* all the terms relating to cultivation, we might find reason for asserting that agriculture was in a more advanced condition than it was in Odyssean times.<sup>1</sup> That is, if we are to argue from words alone. But words, like figures, are apt to be deceptive. It would be rash to assert the superiority of the hairdressing in the *Iliad* because ἄκροκομος, ἀναδέσμη, and ἄμπυξ occur only in it, or greater attention on the part of the Iliadic ladies to the details of their costumes because βαθύκολπος, εὔξωνος, ἐλκεσίπεπλος, and θρόνα are not found in the *Odyssey*.

Still arguing on words alone,—ἐπέων δὲ πολὺς νομὸς ἔνθα

<sup>1</sup> I find the point is touched on by Mure, ii. 161 f.—For architecture see Bader, *Baukunst in d. Od.* Only Pro-

*fanarchitektur*, and that limited, in the *Odyssey*.

*καὶ ἔνθα—*, we could say that, compared with their more advanced brethren of the *Iliad*, the men of the *Odyssey* were in so rude a state that they knew but little of the building of their own bodies or of the anatomy of animals. Friedländer's list (*Zw. h. W.* 751) of eighteen words for parts of the human body which are peculiar to the *Iliad*, is far from complete. The *Iliad* can claim about forty such expressions. The same might be said of words for bodily ailments and affections (Friedländer, *l.c.*). The reason for the difference between the two poems is quite clear to any one who thinks about it. But reasoning on the language alone, we are entitled to say the Iliadic age must have been the more advanced. The medical knowledge of the *Iliad* is indeed a striking fact. Daremberg, quoted by Eyssenhardt (*Die hom. Dichtung*, 32), could find in "the uniformity of surgical principles" a proof of the unity of the *Iliad*. Some scholars have argued that the poet must have been a sort of regimental surgeon.<sup>1</sup> We have all the elements of the controversy that is carried on regarding Shakespeare's knowledge of law and its explanation.

Again, it will probably surprise those who have not drawn out the particulars, to learn that there are some twenty words in the *Iliad* which do not recur in the *Odyssey*, all describing various degrees of blood relationship and general kinship. Here again an advance might be claimed for Iliadic civilisation, if we depended on these terms alone.

"The *Iliad* has a less developed language than the *Odyssey*." This statement is E. H. Meyer's (*Achilleis*, 238), and it is one that is often made in various forms, but to much the same general effect. As regards grammar, in which development ought to be apparent, reference may be made to the Appendix to Miss Stawell's work. We think that it proves, by a most painstaking examination of Dr. Monro's instances, that grammatical differences are practically non-existent. Take the strongest case of all, the three optatives said to be special to the one poem or the other. These are discussed by Miss Stawell, and in App. D *infra*. And see *C.Q.* iv. 78. I think it must be held that no significant difference between the two poems has been made out. And even

<sup>1</sup> Seymour, *Life*, 616 ff., especially 620. See also, on the medical knowledge of the *Iliad*, Körner, *Wesen u. Werth der hom. Heilkunde*, and Fröhlich, *Die Militär-Medicin Homers*. The fact

might almost be used to support the wild assertion that Homer came from Egypt, where *ἱητρὸς ἔκαστος ἐπιστάμενος περὶ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*.

as regards vocabulary, it may be suggested that a careful scrutiny of the structure of words in the poems leaves the same impression. One could make out a list from the *Iliad* of somewhat elaborate compounds, some of them designed to express delicate shades of meaning, which it might be hard to match from the *Odyssey*. Examples are ἀνακυμβαλιάζω, ὁμοστιχάει (?), ἀκροκελαινιόων, ἐν- and μετατροπαλίζομαι, μετοκλάζω, στρεφεδινέω, ἀνηκουστέω, ὑπολευκαίνω, καταδημοβορέω, ἡλιτόμηνος, αἰναρέτη, and δυσ-αριστοτόκεια. There are a number of very expressive adverbs, mostly of compound formation, which are peculiar to the *Iliad*, as ἐπισχερώ, διακριδόν, προτροπάδην, μεταδρομάδην, ἐπιγράβδην, ἐπιλύγδην, ὁμαρτήδην, παραβλήδην, ἀμβλήδην, and ἀμβολάδην. It has been said (*C.P.* v. 88) that there is "a want of adverbs in the *Iliad*." One would be glad to see the evidence of this. Those we have given surely tell against the theory that its language is at an earlier stage of development than that of the *Odyssey*. It is not a symptom of the greater linguistic primitiveness of the *Iliad* that it alone uses the words ἀμαρτο-, ἀφαμαρτο-, ἀπτο-, ἥδυ-, and ἀρτι-επής.

To sum up the effect of the observations scattered through Apps. D and E and Miss Stawell's App. C, and those made in this chapter. When we eliminate from consideration the differences which are based on one or two occurrences, the grammatical uses which can be explained without difficulty, the cases in which no real difference has been proved, others in which there is room for difference of opinion, words which are found mostly or exclusively in combinations obviously appropriate only to the one poem, epithets which are the property of personages that do not appear in both, and words and expressions which, if they are not found in the *Odyssey*, must have been known to its author, if he flourished after the age of the *Iliad*, as they persisted into later Greek; when we allow for the effect of the great difference in the subjects of the two poems, as seen, for example, in formulae and phraseology that owe their existence to the position and adventures of Odysseus and the doings of the Wooers in the *Odyssey*; and when, above all, we reflect with Masson (*Milton*, iii. 6) on the composition of causes on which the frequency or infrequency of a word in any writer depends,—the matter that seems to support the Chorizontic belief is small in bulk and comparatively unimportant.

It may be admitted that there are some usages or expressions, regarding the absence of which from the one poem or the other it is difficult to give a definite, convincing explanation. But they are so few that Friedländer—who is an acknowledged authority, and by no means, as his well-known work on Grote's theory shews, a partisan of unitarian leanings—absolutely declines (*op. cit.* 813 f.) to admit that they are sufficient to justify a conclusion as to difference of authorship. They cannot be held to negative the hypothesis of one author for the two epics. Even if the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* had been on similar themes throughout, *some* differences in their language must have been apparent. As it is, the wonder is that these are not much more pronounced. Rothe and others often insist, and it cannot be denied, that, if one man composed both poems, they must have taken many years of his life to complete, that there may have been a considerable interval of time between them, and that there would have been great scope for variation in vocabulary and style.

Such possibilities cannot be excluded. Tennyson, during a long life, wrote hardly more poetry, if my rough computation is approximately correct, than is contained in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. He admits (Eversley Edn., *Idylls*, p. 453) what we could have believed without being told, that he made his language in some of the *Idylls* "purposely more archaic," and also varied the metre to suit the subject. It would also be easy to detect differences of style and diction between the products of his earlier years and those of his maturer genius. Professor Mackail (*Procgs. Class. Assocn.* 1908, 9) has recently put the case most forcibly for Milton's two epics. "The vocabulary and syntax show marked changes," and many other differences are specified. "Had the two poems reached us as the sole relics of a submerged world, subjected to all the subtle effects of changing dialect, of long transmission through imperfect MSS., of dispersion and re-collection, it would not be beyond the power of scholars to make out a plausible case both for a primary *Paradise Lost* and for the attribution of *Paradise Regained* to a different author belonging to a different generation." Masson tells us the same thing (*op. cit.* ii. 505). "The difference in kind between the two poems is signalised in certain differences in the language and the versification." The difference in vocabulary between the

two epics can be seen at a glance by marking the Concordance. *Paradise Regained* is much shorter by comparison with *Paradise Lost* than the *Odyssey* is compared with the *Iliad*. Yet it is easy to compile a list of over 200 ordinary words, excluding of course proper names, which occur in it and not in the earlier poem.

Miss Stawell (*op. cit.* 107) notes "the difference of vocabulary manifest between Milton's early period and the time of *Paradise Lost*." The influences that operated to produce a change in the style of Shakespeare's later work compared with that of his younger efforts, and the specific effects that are observable, are described by Raleigh (24, 209 f., 220 and 222). For Shakespeare's verse, changing from play to play, see Jusserand in *Modern Philology*, iii. 308, referring to Furnivall and Monro, and for the difference between Chaucer's early and later work, Pollard, *Chaucer Primer*, 55.

Such particulars should surely prescribe caution in drawing inferences of the kind we are seeking to refute. And it must always be remembered that we know nothing of the Homeric language except from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. If the words used by Milton in his poems are only some 8000, while those used by Shakespeare are 15,000 (Masson, *op. cit.* iii. 4), it is certain that there were a vast number of words in the English language of Milton's day which are not found in his poetry. It must have been the same with one author, if there was but one author, of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Many words he would have no occasion to use; many others the hexameter prevented him from employing. Our knowledge of the language would have been even more limited than it is, but for the accident that there is a second poem, in which, to use Masson's words, the *things* and *notions* among which the author's imagination had occasion to move were of kinds very different from those which the first epic embraced. It surely cannot be said that the difference in language between the two poems is more than this one fact may account for.

If we give due weight to such considerations, it seems rash, on what is after all but a slight difference in language, and one that is far from obvious on the surface, to argue separate age or authorship, especially when there is such perfect accord in the mass of the linguistic phenomena. And it is submitted that we may, as the result of our examination of the particulars in Dr.

Monro's comprehensive statement, refuse to accept his conclusion and continue to treat the language of the two epics as one and the same.

*Note.*—Since this chapter was written, another part of the proof has been very effectively refuted. It has been a popular belief that the *Odyssey* shews a marked advance in the number of abstract nouns. Professor Scott, in *C.R.* xxiv. 8 ff., has shewn by careful enumeration of those in *-ίη*, *-σύνη*, and *-τύς*, that this is incorrect. He finds "the numbers are essentially the same." But, "considering the repeated description of fighting-scenes in the *Iliad*,—scenes not inviting the use of the abstract," a preponderance in the *Odyssey* would not have been open to remark.

## CHAPTER VII

### ON LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES

THE more prominent among the alleged faults of language in K will be considered in Chap. VIII., and the rest in App. G. Here we suggest some general considerations which tend to reduce the inferences drawn by the critics, illustrating from blemishes which have been marked in K.

In the first place, we observe that many high authorities will not hear of differences of language and verse in the poems. They proclaim, with Wolf himself, *unus color* and *idem habitus sententiarum, orationis, numerorum*, as stoutly as Mr. Andrew Lang maintains it for the life, society, and manners described. See, e.g., Ilg, *Hom. Krit.* 19 ff.; Naber, 80; Sittl, *Wiederhlg.* 67 f.; Friedländer, *Hom. Krit.* 59 f.; Curtius, *Andeutgn.* 33; Bréal, 47; Ludwich, *Ar.* ii. 229, etc. Rothe always insists on the "uniformity in versification as in linguistic usage."

And the criterion seems to fail its own patrons. Dr. Leaf, who uses it freely, would appear to have felt its weakness. At times he sets little store by linguistic considerations. Anon they are of prime importance. See *Homer and his Age*, 253 f. Later we apply the test to A, which is old and blameless. The list of eccentricities rivals Orszulik's for K. See App. J. Take again the "Continuation" of the *Odyssey*. Its vices are neither many nor serious. See Dr. Monro's Commentary and his App. p. 322. *F* is not mentioned; there is one "later use of the Article." Or the *Theomachy*, Φ 385-513. Dr. Leaf and others condemn it root and branch. Yet "it is remarkably free from linguistic offences," and it is explained that its author must have had "an accurate sense of the old epic language." What are we to do? Modernisms are the badge of all the tribe of late meddlers. But when one of these avoids them, it is said

that he was an exceptionally good linguist. The fertility of Dissectors in such expedients is remarkable. They can even believe that the Pisistratean Commission could reproduce the language and style of the old bards to a marvel. Friedländer, whose authority no one will contest, will have none of it (*Hom. Krit.* 16).

And we find that the method of estimating these "peculiarities" is often somewhat arbitrary. We have, in Chap. IV., deprecated undue interference with the vulgate, but we have also accepted the propriety of restoring where the original is seen to have been affected by mere wear and tear. But the possibility of emendation to any, even the smallest, extent is at times neglected altogether by Dissectors of the poems. For instance, in a multitude of cases of late passages discussed in his *Studien*, Robert considers a mere list of so-called "Ionisms" sufficient. The possibility that they, or some of them, are due to surface changes that have taken place during centuries of transmission, is not regarded. Epithets that render armour "Ionic" may be held to have been inserted, and they may be replaced by those which Robert believes were originally used of what was "Mycenaean" equipment; but blemishes which would yield to a gentle treatment that no scholar objects to, are nevertheless allowed to stand as solecisms. The text must be taken as *fest* (*op. cit.* 576 f.). When, however, we come to what is deemed *Ur-Ilias*, all is changed. When A is examined, this rigorous mood towards emendation is softened, and (*ibid.* 213 f.) that part of the Kernel is treated most generously. But, if the same use be made of the results achieved by the acumen of Zenodotus, Bentley, Nauck, Fick and others, could not the hundreds of passages in the *Iliad* which contain similar Ionisms be similarly purged? The procedure seems to be inconsistent. That which in the *Ur-Ilias* is but "a choleric word," to be readily condoned, appears to be "flat blasphemy" and unforgivable outside it. Dissecting treatises, and especially the literature of the Doloneia and other books of an inferior order, provide many illustrations of this difference of attitude on the part of critics towards such books and old genuine lays respectively.

Objectors, brooding over peculiarities, seem too prone to draw the conclusion that abnormality proves a passage late. Mr. Agar, on the contrary, lays it down (p. 235) that "hardly any

amount of later forms would of itself be sufficient to justify the rejection of a passage." As regards K, Dr. Leaf and Dr. Monro in their *Introductions* find approximation in its language to later Greek. Their lists seem hardly to justify the terms used, but at least the argument touches the essential point. But even approximation is not enough, for after all the great bulk of the Homeric vocabulary and syntax persisted into later Greek. What is wanted, but never supplied, is proof that the word or form was unknown in, say, the 10th century B.C. One expression for which such a disability could be established, would be *πολλῶν ἀντάξιον ἄλλων*, and sufficient to raise suspicion. But unfortunately we cannot "fix the date of novelties" (Allen in *C.R.* xxi. 17; cf. Strickland, *La Quest. Omerica*, 100). Mere rareness is nothing; exceptional and unique phenomena are "in thousands" (Friedländer, *Zw. h. W.* 789, and Ludwich, *Ar.* ii. 325). If singularities prove lateness, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are late throughout.

Again, if such abnormalities prove lateness, it is strange that so many appear in the formulae, which are admittedly an archaic constituent of the epic language. To take a few instances. A common formula, when used (9 times) of a woman or a goddess, becomes *καὶ μιν φωνήσασ' ἔπεια, κ.τ.λ.* Write it thus, and there is neglect of *F*. Write *φωνήσασα Φέπεια*, and there is synizesis, which the critics say is alien to the epic. They also have a special aversion to contraction, but we have *προσηγόριστα*, *δοκεῖ* and *όρθωμαι* in formulae. They bar iterative verbs. See App. F. But *ῳδε δέ (ῳδις ἄρα) τις εἰπεσκε* is common, and *ἔσκε* in the type in P 575. In *δούπτησεν δὲ πεσὼν ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ* we have just the use of *αὐτός* that is objected to in K 25. And so on. These "peculiarities" are *fest* in the text, as the Germans say. That they are not removable modernisms is some reason for saying they are part of the epic language.

Of many of the blemishes detected in K it may be said with certainty that they are no evidence of lateness. All Orszulik's exceptional combinations of words may be dismissed at once. Again, some of his individual words, as *ἐγρηγορτί* and *ἀβροτάξω* and the form *ἄλαλύκτημαι*, are said not to recur in Greek at all. Christ finds *δέελος* a sign of lateness because *δῆλος* occurs in v 333. Dr. Leaf has banished it. See App. B. *δραίνω* is

a pilloried word. It also appears never to recur, and it is in favour of the poet that he follows the almost uniform practice of the poems in avoiding the later forms in *-σείω*. And in respect of a number of the peculiarities there is one striking fact to be reckoned with. Of two alternative forms one is said to be late and the other early. The late form is evidence against a passage. But the strange thing is that other late tracts use the early and eschew the late form. For examples, see on *σπλα* and *τάων*, *τῶν*, pp. 65 and 224 *infra*. Or take the well-known instance of the *-τ* cases of *χρώς*, found, as against the *-οος* forms (94 times), only in K 575 (*χρωτός*) and σ 172, 179 (*χρῶτα*), though the disproportion can be paralleled,—*δουρή*, 150 times, *δούρατι*, 2, *χειρή*, 85, *χερή*, 3. Those in *-οος*, etc., are common, naturally, as the dactyl is preferred and used about three times as often as the spondee (Seymour, *L. and V.* 82). What proof is there that the *-τ* forms are late? To say (*H.G.* 92) that they are post-Homeric does not help. It seems to be a misuse of the word "Homeric." On the other hand, with *φώς*—*φωτός*, *ἀγυνῶτες*, *πεπτηῶτες*, *βεβαῶτα*, etc., not to mention nouns and adjs. in *-ης*, *-ητος*, it seems dangerous to deny *χρωτός* to the *Ur-Ilias*. But our point is this. If, by the date of the Latest Expansions, the *-τ* forms had superseded or were superseding the *-οος* forms, how comes it that Ψ and ω each have the old forms five times and the new ones not once? Or take the dual forms mentioned on pp. 235 f. *infra*. There are three occurrences, in K, N, and Σ. There is not one in any other "late" part of the *Iliad*, or in the *Odyssey*. See Christ, *Hom. od. Homdn.* 15. These are only instances of a phenomenon which will puzzle us frequently. We are left with the impression that the label "late" is affixed in a very random way.

How far approximation to later Greek has been made out must be judged on our examination of the lists of words, etc., specified by objectors. But we can also apply special tests. Thus Jebb and Leaf and others hold that K is as late as the 7th century. But by that time certain linguistic usages had established themselves which are not found in Homer. The fact that the poet of K does not favour them, though he had opportunities for using them, surely tells against the extreme view. Thus we do not find *ἐμαυτόν*, etc., in the poems. The earliest instance is in Hes. *Theog.* 126 (*H.G.* 93). In K 242 and 389, our poet

eschews the new and conforms to the uniform epic usage. ἔστιν ἄν is found first in Hes. *Theog.* 754. Why not K 325,—perhaps also in 62, 89? The φθάνω of I 506, Φ 262, became φθάνω in later Greek. If the explanation given p. 91 *infra*, of the monstrous form παραφθαίησι be correct, it would seem that K follows the ancient practice. Its author has καλός in 34 and 472, and it is always so in the poems, not καλός, as sometimes in Hesiod and later. There is also no trace in K of -ᾶς in the acc. plur. of the 1st decl. There are cases in Hesiod, and ἀθρόας, *Hym. Merc.* 106, is “not to be disturbed.”<sup>1</sup> For elision of final ι, see van Leeuwen in *Mnemos.* xiii. 188 ff. In K 277 we have ὅρνιθ'. Of λιπ' ἐλαίῳ, K 577, he says *certum exemplum duxerim dat. elisi.* And see Mr. Agar's work, *passim*.

Again, Nauck and others deny to the epic the dats. in -ης, -αις, and -οις. See *Ench.* 197 f., and *H.G.* 86, where Dr. Monro is cautious. Mr. Agar (*op. cit.* 352) also hesitates. But it is a view generally accepted. K should, as being so late, favour the short form. But it does not. It has only 2 instances against 5 in A. On a rough count, I find in Hesiod and the Hymns together about 100 short forms in 3600 lines, or 1:36; in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* there are 114 in 27,802, or 1:240. And K agrees with these and not with Hesiod and the Hymns.

Or take the gens. in -οιο, perhaps -οο, and -ον. K should have -ον more frequently than the others. But it has not. The cases in which -ον is certain, it being impossible to read -οι', -οο, or -ο', are 10 in number, just the number in A. In Hesiod and the Hymns there are 202, or 1:19 lines. In K and A the proportion is about 1:60. Again K does not seem to be modern.

Similarly, we shall see in Chap. XII. that K emerges unscathed from the ordeal by *F*, and in App. F that trial by ἐσ and the Iteratives leaves it with no stain on its character. These are four tests dear to the Ionistic School. By means of them Robert, in his *Studien*, works havoc unspeakable with the *Iliad*. Outside the 2146 lines that can still be identified as *Ur-Ilias*, Ιάς is detected everywhere, and assists the condemnation of books, passages, and even single lines. It is enough for us that K's withers are unwrung. But in regard to *F*, ἐσ and

<sup>1</sup> S. and A. *a.l.* As to Θ 378 and ρ 232, see *Ench.* 199; Agar, 85; and Cobet, M.C. 400. In ρ 232, Monro and Lud-

wich read πλευρατ. See also Paley on Hes. *Opp.* 675, and Mure, ii. 344 n. and 377 n.

the Iteratives, we believe that the contents of Chap. XII. and App. F do support the conclusion that these three tests are useless generally, and for *ἄν* we can refer to the authorities cited, p. 221 *infra*. The failure of these specific criteria, the best that scholarship can apply, only tends to confirm the view that the language of the poems is one, in *Iliad* and *Odyssey* alike.

Again, the critics seem to forget the copiousness of the Homeric language,—“the superabundant *πολυωνυμία* and *πολυμορφία* of the Homeric Dialect” (G. Curtius in Hartel, *Hom. Stud.* i.<sup>2</sup> 27). Yet they cannot help admiring at times its “youthful elasticity” and its “astonishing wealth of forms.” Bréal describes it (*Pour mieux*, 91) as “the richest verbal treasure that has ever been at the service of poetry.” The grammar is “of extraordinary variety”; the vocabulary “incomparable in its abundance.” Add to this the licence, *libertas illa dictionis epicæ* (*Ench.* 313)<sup>1</sup> to which the hexameter impelled the bard. Synonyms abound, and the same word is used in a number of shades of meaning. See, e.g., on *ἄτη φῆμις* and *σχέτλιος*, pp. 66, 264 and 265 *infra*. Such great variety and flexibility must tend to produce single or rare occurrences. Variations inspire Friedländer (*Zw. h. W.* 753 f., 763) with caution. He argues our ignorance of the extent of the stock of words at the disposal of the bard.

*σπανίως* “Ομῆρος κακομέτρους ποτεῖ. To avoid them he varied his language. To fit the hexameter, governed by many nice laws, a less common word or form or combination had often to be used. This effect of the metre is generally admitted, though some think it is a hobby that is ridden too hard.<sup>2</sup> But it has certainly been responsible for many of the “peculiarities” in the poems. Where the line is short and metrical laws are less strict, the diction of a poet is not so much affected. The English heroic line is easy to work compared with the hexameter. The language of Milton or of Tennyson’s *Idylls* was probably but slightly influenced. The same, I think, could be said of Vergil compared with Homer. Of the hexameter van Leeuwen says (*Ench.* 564), *probe scio quam multa in lingua Homerica nonnisi ex legibus hexametri aut explicari possint aut excusari.*

<sup>1</sup> A parallel is to be found in the ‘amazing wealth of vocabulary and idiom’ in Shakespeare (Raleigh, 27, and cf. 217 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> See Düntzer, 517 ff.; Ellendt, *D.H.A.* 28 ff.; Ludwich, *Ar.* ii. 124 ff.; and

Thouvenin in *Philologus*, lxiv. 321 ff.—On the other hand a *mistaken* regard for the metre led modernisers into strange errors. See, e.g., for *εὐτέλεος*, Leaf on II 57, and for *ravηλεγής*, Bechtel in *Hermes*, xxxix. 155 f.

Mere variation of quantity is too common to be dwelt on, though Dissectors do sometimes object to late contributors *quos Ἀρες Ἀρες decet sonare*, and who do not exhibit the (supposed) consistency of the old votaries of *Musae severiores*. ἄφαρ occurs with the last syllable not lengthened, only thrice, against ἄφᾶρ, 31 times. One of the former is K 537, which would be a blot on K, but that another is A 349. But we are concerned here with variations of the wording. Alternative forms had to be used, *κορυθάιξ*, *φειδωλή*, *πυρηφόρος*, etc. Epithets had to be varied. Liberties were taken with grammar. The mid. and act. were often used indiscriminately. Restrictions of gender and number were disregarded. Less common arrangements of words, as *ἡματα καὶ νύκτας*, *ἐν νηῶν ἀγύρει*, *δύντα δ' ἐς ἡέλιον*, were used instead of regular pieces of commonplace. Prothystera were caused in the same way. Or asyndeton; cf., e.g., 327 with 365 in Δ. The Article could be inserted or omitted; cf. K 234 and Λ 608. And so forth.

In K, *ὑψόθ' ἔόντι* (*Διι*), 16, is noted as not recurring. *Ζεὺς ἥμενος ὕψι*, T 155, is near it. And cf. π 264. The common expression is *ὑψίζυγος*, always, nom. only, in the second half of the verse. Here the poet, commencing a line, found *ὑψίζυγῳ Διι* difficult. *μεμηκώς*, 362, is noted as peculiar. But Curtius (*Verb*, 290) takes *ἐμέμηκον*, i 439, as a plupft. And we have *μεμακνία*, Δ 435. So *λεληκώς* and *λελακνία*, *τεθηλώς* and *τεθαλνία* (*Ench.* 403). The hexameter did not like *μεμηκνία*, etc. So *νεικεῦν ἄντην*, only K 158 and θ 158. *ἄντην* was more convenient than *ἐναντίον*, T 252, or *ἐσάντα ἰδών*, ρ 239. And so for the frivolous complaint about *χρειώ τόσον ἵκει*, K 142, β 28, ε 189; against *χρειώ ἵκανει*, -*εται* elsewhere. The verb is varied to suit the metre. In K 421 we have *ἐπιτραπέουσι* (on which see *Ench.* 484), obviously because of the forbidding form of *ἐπιτρέπουσι*. The metre probably regulated the choice between *ὅπλα*, *ἔντεα*, *τεύχεα*, and between *Ἄχαιοί*, *Ἀργεῖοι*, *Δαναοί*. Della Seta (*Rendic. R. Accad. Lincei*, 1907, 133 f.) is of a different opinion. But his study of these appellatives proves at least that K is early. *ὕπνοιο*, K 162, is a solitary occurrence, against 15 of *ὕπνου* elsewhere. But one cannot draw an unfavourable inference from the use of the old resolved form.

Time was when the *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* in the poems were a real boon to Dissectors. But the fashion has declined. It is

seen to be unreasonable to require the poet to use only "the regular hackneyed words" (Sittl, *H.G.L.* 79). Jäger, in a pamphlet on Z 168 ff., observes that we have only to apply the procedure to modern poets to prove its absurdity, which is certain. ἄ. λλ. abound in Milton, Shakespeare and Tennyson. See the Concordances. Friedländer's work on those in Homer should have been final. It tells us (p. 747) that one word in four in the Homeric vocabulary is ἄ. λ. It is always referred to with respect, but a critic, when bent on discrediting a line, can seldom resist the temptation to remark on a rare word. See also Dünzter himself in *H.A.* 202.

ἄ. λλ. are of course plentiful in passages the subject matter of which is of a special or exceptional kind, as in descriptions of a great shield Ἡφαιστότευκτος, of a goddess at her toilet, or of the *Schäferei* of the Cyclops. Now the subject of K is unusual, even unique. The critics force this on us. The "atmosphere is new." We agree. The author had for once to narrate the events of a night of anxiety, with much watching and waking, ending in a scouting expedition. One result was that he had to describe dress and accoutrements appropriate to the situation. Α κυνέη is ἄφαλος and ἄλλοφος, and "is called καταῖτυξ." All these words are ἄ. λλ. The poet's own account shews that it was no ordinary casque, but it was evidently the headpiece for Diomede to don (p. 190 *infra*). Nor must we complain that the poet uses πῖλος, when he wants to tell us another casque was lined with felt, which was known from the earliest times (Schräder, *Reallex.*, s.v. *Filz*, and Hehn, *Kulturpfl.*<sup>7</sup> 15). λυκέη is surely in no way remarkable. An author's diction must, when there is a new departure in his narrative, shew corresponding variations in vocabulary. Words may be rare to us; we cannot say they were really rare. The diction of the poems is not to be criticised as if it were the product of a literary age of which everything is known, nor should their author or authors be bound by regulations of the nature of Caesar's *ut tamquam scopulum, sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum*. It is not for us to brand a word in Homer as *insolens*. The language of the poems and the language of (say) 1000 B.C. are not convertible terms. The one must have been but a fraction of the other. To fasten on something rare is an easy way of discrediting a passage. Just so, in Biblical criticism, I have

seen it stated that "the cry of *unhebräisch* is becoming too customary." Not long ago critics styled the language of the New Testament, with 10 per cent of its words  $\ddot{\alpha}.\lambda\lambda.$ , *judengriechisch*. It is now known to be the *κοινή*, and Deissmann estimates the  $\ddot{\alpha}.\lambda\lambda.$  at only 1 per cent. Papyri have wrought the change.. If a miracle were to recover for us some Greek documents of 3000 years ago, many philological rarities might acquire a different character.. At present we are dependent on the metre (Curtius, quoted in *Ench.* 313 n.).

Düntzer (*H.A.* p. 323) and Orszulik admit that many of the  $\ddot{\alpha}.\lambda\lambda.$  are unimportant. But their lists of unimportant words do not agree, and Dr. Monro mentions some which they discard.. Such differences tend to emphasise the low value of inferences from  $\ddot{\alpha}.\lambda\lambda.$  A word is remarkable only if used once instead of a common word, and there is no obvious reason, such as metrical convenience, for its use in the one place.

A number of the  $\ddot{\alpha}.\lambda\lambda.$  on which special stress has been laid are discussed in Chap. VIII, and the rest in App. G. The total in K is not unduly high. Friedländer (*op. cit.* 746 f.) finds that there is 1 to every  $14\frac{1}{3}$  lines in the *Iliad*, 1 to 14 in the *Odyssey*, 1 to  $14\frac{1}{7}$  in the two poems together, and 1 to  $14\frac{1}{2}$  in K. So our author was not specially addicted to the use of rare words. The same may be said of other suspected books, as Ω. Peppmüller admits it (*Comment.* xliv). But he has an explanation. Suspected books have few  $\ddot{\alpha}.\lambda\lambda.$ , because, being late, they borrow freely from other parts of the poems. We need not criticise this reasoning.

In regard to many of the single occurrences, the inferences against the poet are discounted by the fact that he knows and uses the familiar word or phrase. The fact that he sometimes eschews it may be due to many reasons. But, whatever the cause, it certainly tells against the charge that he is "a late imitative poet," revelling, as Cauer puts it (*Grdfrgn.* 441), in the manipulation of the traditional commonplace. It is hardly fair to denounce his imitativeness and his independence in the same breath.

An example is  $\pi\acute{o}s\acute{t}\acute{s}$  "Ηρης ἡγκόμοιο, of Zeus, in that much traduced simile in 5 ff. Elsewhere Zeus is  $\acute{e}p\acute{r}y\acute{g}dou\acute{p}\acute{t}\acute{o}s$   $\pi\acute{o}s\acute{t}\acute{s}$  "Ηρης, which the author could have used here by writing  $\grave{\alpha}\sigma\tau\rho\acute{a}\pi\tau\eta\acute{s}\acute{t}\acute{o}s$  instead of  $\grave{\alpha}\sigma\tau\rho\acute{a}\pi\tau\eta\acute{s}$ . What is the inference?

That he was so late that he did not know the familiar description? But he uses it in 329. That he was modern and Odyssean, and avoided or was ignorant of archaic epithets? The one he uses is thoroughly Iliadic in form. But some freedom must be allowed. A stock epithet is at times replaced by another. Athené is *μεγάθυμος* only θ 520 and ν 121, although the common *γλαυκώπιδ*' could have been used. Another case is *ἐπιτρέπω*, said to be used = "trust" in K 59, and = "yield to" in 79. But in 116 and 421 it has its common sense, *committo*. In 59 and 79 there is but little divergence (Lawson, *a.l.*, and Ebel. and Seiler, *s.v.*). Another case is *ἰρόν*. Düntzer and others point out that the plural *ἱερά* is more common. But K has it in 46. And surely *ἰρόν* is better in 571 than the more general *ἱερά*, *sacra*, even if we do not with some critics take Dolon's *ἔναρα* to be the *ἰρόν*. See the Commentaries, *a.l.*

Many of the rare words in K are from the same roots as others which are common, or are derivatives from them or compounded with them. In most of these only an extremist would find cause for remark. The point is dealt with by Friedländer (714 ff. and 755 ff.). He cannot (p. 768) point to a single word that betrays itself by its derivation as post-Homeric. A number of his illustrations are from K. *ῥοιζέω*, 502, is supported by *ῥοῖξος*, Π 361 and ι 315. Orszulik would distinguish the sounds in the three cases and make *ῥοιζέω* = "whistle." But Odysseus may have signalled by some sound short of that. Another is *δωρέομαι*, 557. *δωρητός* occurs Ι 526. Tastes of course differ, but it may be suggested that *δωρήσαιτο* is better than *δοίη* would be. Odysseus, in reply to Nestor's speculations, is putting a general case of a god making a special presentation to a favourite. But after all, the explanation of the longer word may be simply metrical convenience, as it is perhaps of *δοίης δωτίνην*, ι 268. For *ἀγλαΐζομαι*, 331, cf. *ἐπαγλαΐζομαι*, Σ 133. As to *ἀσήμαντος*, 485, cf. *σημάντορος οὐ παρεόντος*, Ο 325. *σημαίνω* and *σημάντωρ* are found in both poems. *ἄραβος* (*όδόντων*), 375, is ἄ. λ. But *ἄραβέω* is frequent. That *πάταγος* is used in the only other passage, N 283, where the "chattering" of teeth from fright is mentioned, is nothing serious. Other words of the kind objected to in K are given by Friedländer, pp. 760 ff.

In the case of K every possible ground of objection is taken.

Orszulik's remark that there are five words which, occurring only in K, occur in it *frequently*, may be judged from the following particulars. ἐφιξάνω, 26, 91 f., 578. In 91 it is more probably plain ιξάνω, which occurs Ψ 258, ω 209, and in other compound forms Σ 25, ε 3. Zenodotus read ἐφίξανον, Τ 11; the moderns prefer ἐνίξανον. κτιδέη, 335, 458, of Dolon's cap,—practically one occurrence. So for νεήλυδες, 434, 558, and ἐκπυνθάνομαι, 308, 320, 395,—almost the same line thrice repeated. Ebeling, Seiler, and M. da Costa do not recognise the compound. For the fifth word, φύξις, see p. 63 *infra*. This seems to be trivial argument.

Again, Dünzter observes that the author of K is specially addicted to the use of *πιφαύσκω* and *φθέγγομαι*. He uses the former twice; 202 and 478. Why should he not? And the latter is found four times,—67, 85, 139, and 457. The first three occurrences are all in the same connection, and very pertinent to the action. We do not object to the author of A for using *χολώω*, 4, *χόλος*, 5, and *ἄποινα* and *ἐκατόμβη*, 7 times each, or to the occurrence of the expression *κίνυντο φάλαγγες* three times in Δ. Both *πιφαύσκω* and *φθέγγομαι* are common in the poems.

And lastly, there are three classes of cases which do not seem worthy of detailed notice.—*Compound verbs* occurring only in K, or elsewhere only rarely. In a number of cases I find other authorities do not recognise the compounds, but prefer to take the verb in *tmesi*, as it is called. See Friedländer (*op. cit.* 755 f.), Krüger (*Dial.* ii. 179), and Cauer (Pref. to *Odyssey*, xxxii.), etc. In other cases the simple verb is found in other books.—*Verbs in the mid. voice*. The interchange of the two voices in the poems is *admodum notabilis libertas* (*Ench.* 276; cf. Dünzter, 528, and Grosse, *Syntax d. Med. u. Pass.* 14). The metre was often the cause (Ellendt, *D.H.A.* 21 ff.). Compare, e.g., *βιάζεται οἷον ἔόντα*, ι 410, and *βιάζετε μοῦνον ἔόντα*, μ 297. Also, mid. forms, as *βαλόμενος*, *ἔλόμενος*, were often inconvenient in the hexameter.—*Comparatives and superlatives*. *ἐκαστάτω*, 113,—the compar. only η 321. *προφερέστερος*, 352, θ 221, φ 134,—the superl. only θ 128 and (with *v.l.* *πολὺ φέρτατος*) 129. There is nothing in this. Similar cases could be quoted from other books. Milton uses “nigh” frequently, but “nigher” never, and “nighest” only once. The form of

*βράσσων* is objected to. Orszulik refers to *πάσσων*, ζ 230, etc., and *μάσσων*, θ 203. "One sees at once that these are more recent forms"! But *θάσσων*, N 819, O 570, and *θᾶσσον* (adv.), frequent, should have been referred to.

And three final remarks before we proceed to detailed examination. First, it is not claimed that the result will be to purge the Doloneia of peculiarities. That would put it in a category by itself. There is *unus color* in the language of the poems, of course. We have seen that the best authorities are agreed as to that. But there are exceptional uses everywhere, even in the *Mēnis*. All we claim is that these are not more noticeably frequent in K than elsewhere. If we exclude the cases in K which can be shewn by Homeric analogy *not* to be peculiar, those which disappear by the smallest possible emendation, those regarding which learned opinion is as strong one way as the other, and those from which neither lateness nor approximation to later Greek can be inferred, the balance to the debit of K seems quite negligible. And secondly, we call special attention to the Forms and Constructions which are said to be abnormal, and which are discussed in Chap. VIII. and App. G. It will be seen how few and unimportant they are. It may almost be said that not one exceptional construction has been established, and the few forms that are special to the Book can be explained without difficulty. Surely this is enough to dispose of the theory that it is very late. If it was separated by centuries from the epic bloom, is it conceivable that differences on such points could be so few and so small?

And lastly, it may be admitted that the verbal peculiarities *on the surface* of K are perhaps more numerous than in some other parts of the *Iliad*. But an explanation may be suggested. I think it cannot be doubted that the Doloneia must have been specially popular for recitation in the ancient world. The incident described is one that would appeal to audiences. It is of surpassing interest in itself, and the heroes of it are Odysseus and Diomede. The lay is, as we are often reminded, easily detachable from the rest of the *Iliad*, and so suitable for separate recitation. See Cauer, *Grdfrgn.* 502. If, then, it was often recited, the copies required would be specially numerous. That would involve more copying, and more copyists' errors. And that is just what we find. The proportion

of irregularities which can be cured by trifling, unobjectionable changes in the vulgate is large. If we allow for these, and set aside also the cases which can be explained, such as  $\phi\acute{\nu}\xi\varsigma$ ,  $\Lambda\eta\acute{\eta}\tau\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\tau\bar{o}\bar{i}\sigma\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ , etc., the balance, we affirm, is no greater than for other parts of the poems which are generally regarded as ancient. It is this residuum that has to be weighed. If, as we feel assured, it is not more serious than remains for A,—which was no doubt a popular lay that suffered as K did,—, then K has been sufficiently vindicated.

## CHAPTER VIII

### LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES OF K—THE HEAD AND FRONT

THE great mass of the peculiarities of the diction of K noted by Orszulik and others seem to be quite unimportant, but we dare not leave them unconsidered. They are discussed in App. G. Here we mention all that appear to be of any moment. They are stock examples of the eccentricity imputed to the author of K, they appear in most enumerations of his solecisms, and they have had their effect, I do not doubt, in turning many an honest mind against his lay without further reflection. I include here only ἄ. λλ., forms, meanings, and constructions. The exceptional combinations seem generally trivial.

First, some *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα*:

Ληῆτις, 460. "Instead of" ἀγελείη (Düntzer; so Leaf and LaRoche, *a.l.*). The latter word occurs *Il.* 5, *Od.* 3. It might have been used here in place of ληῆτιδι. But are the words equivalent? The origin and meaning of these old epithets are notoriously uncertain. ἀγελείη is taken by some as = "leader of the people." Fick seems to connect it with plunder (*Personennamen*, 41, 183). Πενθεσίλεια he derives from λαός (*ibid.* 373, 397). The occurrences of ἀγελείη do not support the derivation from λεία, but, as epithets sometimes became fixed, we can hardly press the point. Still, in a case like ν 359, where the goddess is κουροτρόφος, and where θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη would suit, the use of "Our Lady of the Spoils" does jar somewhat. Again, Ληῆτις seems to be a title. Ἀθήνη Λ. had a cult at Olympia (Pausan. v. 14, 5; cf. Gruppe, *Griech. Mythol.* 1208 *n.*). In Preller-Robert's Index the word is shewn as a cult-epithet. And see Farnell, *Cults*, i. 309. He does not mention ἀγελείη. On the whole Ληῆτις is

an appropriate word in K 460. We cannot say with certainty that its rival would be.

$\delta\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\lambda\sigma$ , 466, in a difficult passage, certainly corrupt. See the commentators, especially Leaf, and Sayce in App. to Mahaffy's *H.G.L.* 277 f. It is impossible, with opinion very strong that the passage is corrupt, to attach any importance to  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\lambda\sigma$ . Dr. Leaf amends to  $\delta\grave{e}\ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega\nu$ . See App. B.

ἐπιδίφριάς, 475. Rhēsus is asleep, and his horses are tethered ἐξ ἐπιδίφριάδος πυμάτης ιμᾶσιν. Here again it is said that the common word ἄντυξ has been discarded. But the poet must have known it, and also a set form of commonplace, ἄντυγα πάρ πυμάτην and the like, in which it occurs and which he could have used here,—say, ἄντυγος ἐκ πυμάτης βοέοις (cf. X 397, Ψ 324) ιμᾶσι δέδεντο. Then why does he, late and imitative, eschew the common and adopt a new word? Because the latter (from ἐπιδίφριος, “on a car,” o 51, 75) seems to have meant the whole of the breastwork of the car, and ἄντυξ the rail at its top running round to the rear part. Reichel (*Hom. Waff.*<sup>2</sup> p. 122) thought otherwise, but authority is against him. See Helbig, 127, 144; Engelmann in *Jb.* 1902, 224; Naumann, *ibid.* 1889, 108; Rumpf, *Beitr. z. hom. Wörterkrg.* 15 ff.; Ebel. s.v. ἐπιδ.; Leaf on E 727; and, for the schol., Paley on K 475.—In a car at rest in the field the reins were drawn back and tied to one end of the ἄντυξ. In our case the ιμάντες are not necessarily reins, but perhaps heel-ropes. Hobbles were used by Poseidon, N 36. And see Hayman, vol. iii. App. H 3. It would be good to fasten such heel-ropes to the lower part of the breastwork (ἐπιδ. πυμ.); with the point of the pole resting on the ground, there would be less chance of the car being dragged or overturned.

*σαυρωτήρ*, 153. "Everywhere else called *οὐρίαχος*." But apparently the latter was the whole butt-end of the spear, the former only the spike in it (Leaf, *a.l.*; Ebel. *s.v.* ἔγχος—*cuspis brevior*, *qua in terram infigebant otiosi*—and cf. Ridgeway, *E.A.G.* 307). Hence *πελεμίζω* with *οὐρόν*. in all its occurrences, N 443, ΙΙ 612, P 528. *σαυρός* could not have been used in those places, nor *οὐρόν*. in K. It is not proved that the *σαυρός* was a modern invention. See Tsountas and Manatt, *Mycen. Age*, 205. It was in use in late Mycenaean times. No specimen has been found, but it is figured on the Warrior Vase. And as few spear heads

have been found, swords and spears being "arms for the few" in those days (*ibid.*, *l.c.* and 144 ff.), nothing can be inferred against the spike. ἀμφίγυος, of a spear, may = "pointed at both ends," but that is not certain. But there are other indications of the spike. Achilles, X 225, would not stick his spear *head* in the ground, nor Diomede his, Z 213, nor the Achaean host theirs in Γ 135. The spike must have been general (Helbig, 340). The solitary mention of it by name need not make difficulty. For all the fighting in the *Iliad*, οὐρίαχος occurs only thrice. μέτωπον, as part of a helmet, is found only Π 70, but the passage is unimpeachable.

φύξις, only in K, and there three times. The phenomenon is striking. To Düntzer it is a trump card. The three passages are 310 f. = 397 f., and 447. In the two first, he says, the poet could "easily" have written βουλεύουσι φυγήν γε, and in the third φυγέειν. The vulgate seems preferable. And his dictum that φύξις is used for φυγή or φόβος cannot be accepted. φόβος is barred. And as for φυγή, it is rarer than φύξις! It never occurs in the *Iliad* (though φύγαδε does, which some, as LaRoche, *Stud.* 88, think is from it), and only twice in the *Odyssey*. And, though φύξις does not recur, we have φύξηλις (perhaps better φυξηλός,—van Herwerden in *Hermes*, xvi. 351 ff.), P 143, and φύξιμος, ε 359, which the lexica say are derived from it. It is said to be another form of φεῦξις, which occurs only (cf. ἀνάφυξις (*κακῶν*) in Plato) *Antig.* 362. Jebb's translation (*a.l.*), "means of escape," suits our passages admirably. In the first two the Achaeans are supposed to be planning to extricate themselves from their straits, not to be meditating a φόβος or rout. In the third, Dolon is told there is no hope for him. He is not told not to think of "bolting." The injunction would have been superfluous. The heroes held him fast, and Diomede's spear would not have gone over his shoulder a second time. So Ebel. *s.v.*,—*non est proprie fuga, sed Dolon vetatur sperare se liberatum iri.*

διοπτεύω, 451, and διοπτήρ, 562. ἐποπτεύω, π 140, and ὁπτήρ, ξ 261 = ρ 430, in the same sense as διοπτήρ in K,—one sent to spy out the land. Now σκοπός is generally used of one set at a spot to watch,—as in B 792, Σ 523, Ω 799, δ 524, π 365. With στρατοῦ in K 562 surely διοπτήρ was the better word. And as to the verb, what other could have been used?

*διασκοπιασόμενος* would be formidable; it would fill half a hexameter. *σκοπιάσων* was barred by its initial tribrach.

ἐκτάδιος, 134. Nestor pins about his person *χλαῖναν* . . . *διπλῆν, ἐκταδίην*. The garment was evidently a very ample one, double the size of the ordinary *χλαῖνα ἀπλοῖς* mentioned elsewhere. It is referred to also in Γ 126, X 441, τ 225 f. and 241 f., and perhaps in ν 224. But only here is it *ἐκταδίη*. The meaning of the adj. is not quite clear. Dr. Leaf, *a.l.*, says “capable of being spread out,” and so of being used, as ordinary *χλαῖναι* regularly were, as a coverlet at night. So Studniczka, *Beitr.* 75. Miss Abrahams (*Dress*, 26) translates “stretched out straight,” and thinks it describes the way the garment lay on the person when worn. Be that as it may, as the word is not used in place of one used in other passages, there is nothing to be argued from its occurrence in 134.

ἀντιτορέω, 267, is not *ἄ. λ.* It recurs (= “pierce”) E 337. In K it is used of the burglar Autolycus, *patriae non degener artis*, breaking into a house, and in this sense it is used twice in the Hymn to his father or patron, Hermes. As there appears to be no other case of burglary in the poems (Seymour, *Life*, 436 n.), nothing can be argued against K. That the verb has a special meaning here is nothing. No one would object to *περονάω*, K 133, = “fasten on,” because in H 145 and N 397 it has its primary sense, “pierce.”

ἀηθέσσω, 493. See Leaf, *a.l.* I cannot find any other place in Homer where it could be used. It would not do in such passages as P 5, I 440. Friedländer, *Zw. h. W.* 781, says of this word, *befremdet mich nicht*.

ξυρόν and ἀκμή in a phrase said to be proverbial,—but see p. 204 *infra*,—in 173, *νῦν γὰρ δὴ πάντεσσιν ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἵσταται ἀκμῆς*. Orszulik says the expression has “a thoroughly modern stamp,” and Nitsche that the mention of razors is a “real anachronism.” These statements seem too bold. There were razors in Mycenaean, probably in earlier times (Leaf, *a.l.*; Frazer, *Pausan.* vol. iii. 131 and v. 399, 522; and Schräder, *Reallex.*, s.v. *Messer*). I have seen it stated that razor and axe are *arisches Gemeingut*. So their mention in K is less strange than the silence of the poems generally. It cannot be admitted that everything must be mentioned at least twice. The flute and the pipe are mentioned only in K and Σ, both books of the depressed class. But Mosso

(*Palaces*, 322) found in Crete what seemed to be two pipes of a σύριγξ probably 8000 years old. And see Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altert.* ii. 582.—As for ἀκμή, its derivative ἀκμηνός, *vigens*, ψ 191, presupposes it.

δυσωρέω, 183, “keep painful watch” or “be disturbed in watching” (Monro, *a.l.*). Is there any other passage where such watch over flocks and herds at night is described? In the end of ξ preparations are made. In the simile in M 299 ff., where φυλάσσω is used, it is not certain that the watch is kept at night.—It may be observed that of 20 words in the poems commencing with δυσ-, no fewer than 9 are ἄ. λλ.

πευκεδανός, 8, in the phrase πολέμοιο μέγα στόμα πευκεδανοῖο. The rarity is hardly more remarkable than in the cases of two very similar words, περιπευκές (*βέλος*), only Λ 845, and ἐχεπευκές (*βέλος*), A 51, Δ 129. Our author might have used λευγαλέοιο or ὁἰζυροῖο, each of which is used once of war, or δακρυδέντος. But perhaps an epithet with a more active sense was appropriate. φθαρτικὸν τὸ στόμα (schol.), and πευκεδανός is “sharp,” “piercing,” even “destructive” (Autenrieth), or *funeste* (Boisacq). Ten other epithets of war which are ἄ. λλ. are enumerated by Hoch (*Lexik. Bemerkgn.* vi.), and 9 of these are in the *Iliad*. One of the lines in a papyrus fragment of Λ may have ended in πευκεδανοῖο (Leaf on Λ 514).

Strange meanings:—

προπάροιθε, adv., in temporal sense, only 476 (Düntzer). But the locative sense is quite good here with ἵδων. Cf. the common ἄντα ἵδων. Again, our word is certainly used of time in the *Iliad*, as in Λ 734, *non tantum in Odyssea, ut chorizontes volunt* (Lehrs, *Ar.* 115; cf. Jevons, 25). It *may* have the temporal sense in X 197 also. Lehrs, *l.c.*, says it has. See Dr. Leaf on K 476 against Düntzer, and *Ench.* 544. There is nothing proved against K here.

ὅπλα = “armour,” 254 and 272. See p. 27 *supra*, and cf. Düntzer, *H.A.* 324 f. Holm pointed out that ὅπλα occurs with this meaning only Σ 614 and T 21, and referred to the use of ὥπλιζομαι, Θ 55 (see Leaf’s note) and ω 495, and of ἀφοπλίζομαι, Ψ 26. This is unimportant to those who do not believe that Σ, T, Θ, Ψ and ω are late. Moreover, if ὅπλα = “arms” is a late usage, how is it that all the other late books of the *Iliad*, and the *Odyssey* throughout, though it knows the

word and often has it = "ship's tackle," eschew the usage complained of and instead employ  $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\alpha$  over and over again? The commentaries throw no light on the word, and its etymology seems to be doubtful (Prellwitz, s.v., and L. Meyer, *Handbuch*, i. 512).

$\grave{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota$ , 391. The plural is objected to by Düntzer. But see I 115 and T 270. For  $\grave{\alpha}\chi\acute{e}\omega\nu$  in T 298, Bentley conjectured  $\grave{\alpha}\tau\acute{e}\omega\nu$ . There is more in Dr. Leaf's remark *a.l.* that " $\grave{\alpha}\tau\eta\sigma\iota$  is so far peculiar here that it is used of 'blinding,' deception, of a purely human origin."  $\grave{\alpha}\tau\eta$  is a word with a number of shades of meaning. It is, in one form or another, *Verirrung des Bewusstseins* (Jäger, *Hom. u. Hor.* 81, quoting Nägelsbach). In II 805 the word has for once, according to Leaf, *a.l.*, the "purely physical sense" of *stupor*, but usually it is "hurt done to the mind" (Jebb, 50 *n.*). It means this in our passage. See Ebeling, *s.v.*; Goebel, *Lexilogus*, ii. 131; and Gladstone, *Studies*, ii. 160 f. Scherer, *De Graecorum ATHΣ notione et indole*, 14, seems to find nothing unusual in K 391.

Rare forms:—

$\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha$  for  $\epsilon\iota$ , a note of Odyssean affinity, as it is found only K 450,  $\tau$  69,  $v$  179 ( $\epsilon\xi\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha$ ). But the 2nd pers. sing. of  $\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$  does not occur in the other twenty-three books of the *Iliad*. Their (supposed) many authors had not occasion to use it. How then can we say what form of that particular part of the verb the original poet, the expanders, and the *densus vulgus* of the interpolators would have favoured?

$\tau\bar{o}\iota\sigma\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ , only K 462 and 5 times in the *Odyssey*, is in much the same case. The later form of the dat. pl. occurs four times in the *Odyssey*, but in the *Iliad* outside K there is no occurrence of the dat. plur. in any gender. I am not aware whether this has been noticed, but I have not seen it expressly stated by any of the many authorities who comment on the form,—as Leaf, *a.l.*; Christ, *Interpol.* 199; *Ench.* 265 f., *H.G.* 93, 307; Hinrichs, *Aeol.* 115; van Herwerden, *Q.H.* 131; Weck in *Jahrb. k. P.* 1888, 225 ff., etc. One might think, for all that is said, that the regular form of the dat. plur. abounds in the poems. With no occurrence of it in the *Iliad* outside K, I do not see how any inference can be drawn.

$\mu\bar{u}\gamma\acute{\jmath}\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ , 365. The only 2nd. fut. pass. in the poems, unless  $\delta\alpha\acute{\jmath}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\iota$  is to be reckoned. See *Ench.* 275 f.; Curtius, *Verb*,

5, 490; *H.G.* 59; and Leaf, *a.l.* Van Leeuwen suggests *μιγάσθαι* from *μιγάζομαι*, which is used θ 271, though in a very different sense. This seems good. *μιγήσθαι* would mean "go in among," "join," as in Γ 209, K 180, etc. But the sense required is "rush into," "tumble in among," which *μιγάζομαι* may well have expressed. Verbs in -άξω are often "frequentative or intensive, but with a trace of contempt" (Monro, *H.G.* 397, and on ν 9). Bréal, *Pour mieux*, 199, translates *μιγάζομαι* *se mêler*. A scribe might easily substitute the more familiar word and form.—In either case, the passage shews the poet knew the construction of *μέλλω* with the fut. inf., which is interesting with reference to the doubt raised whether *λίστεσθαι*, 455, is meant for a pres. or a fut.

*Θήκατο*, 31, but also Ξ 187. The peculiarity is that it is the only mid. aor. in -κα in Homer. Of *τίθημι* the *Ench.* says, 381, *singulae formae huius verbi multis locis occurunt*. The alternative form ἔθετο is not one suitable for use in hexameter verse. In ξ 19 the poet seems to have been driven to use ἐπέκειντο by the unsuitability of ἐπετέθησαν or -θεν.

*ἐνξού*, 373. As it stands, from a form ἐνξος (Leaf, *a.l.*), which would be ἄ. λ. But if *χείμαρρος* and -ρροος from ρέω, why not ἐνξος and -οος from ξέω? And why not read ἐνξοῦ from ἐνξοος? Bechtel (*Vocalcontr.* 98) does so, and sees in the contraction evidence that K is late. That need not deter us. Or read ἐνξόου, if Hartel's ἐνξόων is admissible in θ 215 (Solmsen, 130). Mr. Platt (*J. Phil.* xviii. 132 f.) proposes ἐνξόο with correption, pointing to δύδοον as a dissyllable in η 261, ξ 287, where, however, many read δύδοατον. In *Ench.* 205, the line K 373 is thought to be *vitiose traditus*. I had suspected the same. We must translate, on the vulgate, "over his shoulder the point of the spear stuck in the ground," which is not good. We want "*sped* over his shoulder *and stuck in the ground*," in fact a sentence of the form of those in X 275 f. and Π 478. Could ἐνξου have displaced ἀιξεν? It may be noticed that ἐνξοος, which is common, is not elsewhere used as an epithet of δόρυ, and that it always occupies the place in the verse which it has in K. That makes it possible that it slipped in by the mistake of a copyist. It may be objected that there is no precedent for ἀιξεν except ὑπᾶξει, Φ 126. But does the correption of the ἄ require to be vouched?

*ἐμέο*, 124, notable in face of some 160 occurrences of other forms of the gen. *ἐμέθεν*, near it in metrical value, is found 18 times,—13 times before a word commencing with a vowel (*τ* 99) or a single consonant, and 5 before *ξ* in parts of *ξυνίημι*. It is possible that these 5 cases are susceptible of explanation (Bekker, *Hom. Blät.* i. 158 f.), and that none of these occurrences of *ἐμέθεν* was originally before two consonants, whereas *ἐμέο* is. Mr. Agar (p. 95) would restore *ἐμέο* before *ξύνες*, etc. Perhaps there is not aberration, but conformity to rule here. But, however that may be, there are traces of *ἐμέο* and *μεο* in the poems. Cases like *ἐμεῦ ἔκλυες* may have been originally written with *ἐμέ̄*. *μεν* may have replaced *μεο*. See *Mnemos.* xiii. 215; *H.G.* 353; Agar, 284 f., and cf. his remarks on p. 174 on *οὐρανόο -όθεν*; and Bechtel in Robert's *Stud.* 262.

*Perfects in -κα.* “The perfects in *-κα* from derivative verbs,”—i.e., apparently, those in *-άω*, *-έω*, etc.,—“*βεβίηκεν* (145, 172), *παρώχωκεν* (252), *ἀδηκότες* (98, 312, 399, 471),” are one of the traces of later formation in K (Monro). This is repeated by Dr. Leaf in his *Introduction*, and by Jebb, 123 n.

*παρώχωκεν* or *-ηκεν* might be taken as a late indication,—see instances given by Veitch,—but the verb from which *ἀδηκότες* comes and the form *βεβίηκεν* appear never to recur in Greek. *ἀδηκότες* is quite doubtful in origin. See Dr. Leaf on K 98, and *Ench.* 161, where Dr. Monro's derivation, *ἀ-σFαδ-έω*, is rejected by van Leeuwen, who adds (p. 403) of a number of perf. ptcps. like *FεFαδηκότες*, *fortasse -ηότες sunt scribenda, codicibus non invitisi*. See to the same effect Dr. Monro himself in *H.G.* 29. And *ἀρηότες* has been conjectured (Schulze, 454). This one then is a doubtful form and must be left out of consideration. *βεβίηκεν* reappears in II 22, in a passage which is defended by Dr. Leaf with all his strength, and which Robert admits to his *Ur-IIlias*. As for *παρώχωκεν*, it is in one of the few lines in K which are generally held to be interpolated, though we (p. 223 *infra*) shall argue against the view. On the above statement, these perfects do not appear to supply much positive evidence against K. And their origin has not been ascertained beyond all doubt. So Kühner-Blass, ii. 97, where a discarded view of Curtius' is preferred to his later opinion, which Monro and Bréal (*Pour mieux*, 243 f.) and others accept.

These perfects are included in the Index to the *H.G.* ("*Iliad*, characteristics of particular books, esp. I, K, Ψ, Ω") with a number of other indications of affinity with the *Odyssey*. But in Dr. Monro's discussion in the body of that work no form is quoted against I, Ψ, Ω, except  $\tau\epsilon\theta\alpha\rho\sigma\gamma\kappa\alpha\iota$  in I. In Ψ and Ω, I find no form of the kind that cannot be paralleled in other books of the *Iliad*. In the *Telemachy*, α-δ, containing 2222 lines, I find nothing at all. According to Loebell (*Quaestt. de Perfecti Homci. forma et usu*, 18) there are 19 such perfects in Homer. But in the whole of the *Odyssey* there are only 2 that do not appear in the *Iliad*. It is surely strange that more traces of this later formation are not to be found in "late" parts of the poems.

*Iterative Verbs.* See a note in App. F. Though such verbs are a characteristic of late books, no charge has been or could be made against K.

#### Unusual Constructions:—

$\mu\acute{e}\lambda\lambda\omega$ , 454, "to be about to," with the pres. instead of the fut. inf. See Leaf, *a.l.*, and on Π 47 and Ψ 773, and cf. Monro on τ 95. The question is whether  $\lambda\acute{i}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  can be regarded as a fut. Mr. Platt (*J. Phil.* xxi. 40) thinks not. It is pres., and one of the "innumerable tokens that K is very late." But see a full discussion in *Ench.* 279 f.; *nihil insoliti est K* 454. The verb is taken as fut., and the form  $\lambda\acute{i}\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  accepted for Π 47. See *ibid.* 460, and the note to Π 47 in van L. and Da C.'s *Iliad*. See also p. 67 *supra*.

*Position of Enclitics.* Dr. Monro (*H.G.* 338) says that in this matter "a less strict usage may be traced" in K, and he instances  $\eta\ \tau\acute{i}s\ \kappa\epsilon\nu$ , 44,  $\epsilon\acute{i}\ \mu\acute{e}\nu\ \delta\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\rho\acute{o}\nu\ \gamma\epsilon\ \kappa\epsilon\lambda\acute{e}\nu\acute{e}\teta\mu\ \mu'\ \alpha\acute{u}\tau\acute{o}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{e}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ , 242,  $\nu\acute{u}\nu\ \alpha\acute{u}\tau\acute{e}\ \mu\acute{a}\lambda\acute{i}\sigma\acute{t}\alpha\mu\ \mu\acute{e}\ \phi\acute{l}\alpha\iota$ , 280,  $\grave{\alpha}\lambda\grave{\lambda}'\ \acute{\epsilon}\grave{\omega}\acute{m}\acute{e}\nu\ \mu\acute{u}\nu$ , 344,  $\acute{o}\acute{u}\kappa\acute{e}\teta'\ \acute{\epsilon}\acute{p}\acute{e}\acute{u}\teta\ \sigma\acute{u}\ \pi\acute{h}\mu\acute{m}\acute{a}\ \pi\acute{o}\teta'\ \acute{\epsilon}\acute{s}\acute{s}\acute{\sigma}\acute{e}\teta\iota$ , 453. Dr. Leaf repeats the general statement in his *Introduction*, but, besides mentioning the irregularity in notes on 344 and 453, does nothing to help out the objection. Dr. Monro himself adds, "the subject, however, needs more detailed investigation." For line 44 we may refer to the *H.G.* itself, 336, and to Agar on § 122.  $\acute{o}\acute{s}\ \tau\acute{i}s$  is treated as a single word. For line 453, we refer to *H.G.* 339. As regards the division of the line into two equal parts, I observe that Engelbrecht (*Die Cäsuren des hom. Hexam.* ii.) gives two instances from A,—106 and 179. Line 344 in K is usually amended,—see p. 235 *infra*. In 280 it

may be questioned if there is anything unusual. At any rate, there can be, even on Dr. Monro's own shewing, a very small residuum of irregularity.

*οὐδέν*, 216, adjectival use (Monro, *Introduction* to K, *H.G.* 323; Jebb, 189; Leaf on Θ 178, and *Ench.* 270). Van Leeuwen shews that in a great majority of the occurrences of *οὐδέν*, *οὐ τι* can be read, the corruption being due to desire to remove hiatus (legitimate after *τι*). In our passage the Leyden editors, though they excise the line, read *οὐ τι*. But is there any real need to amend? The point is that the adjectival use of *οὐδέν* is rare, while the adverbial use, as in A 244, 412, and Π 274, is comparatively common. But surely the use of *οὐδείς* as an adj. must have been established before its neuter could be used adverbially? We have *οὐδενὶ εἰκων* in the *Mēnis*, X 459. There also the Leyden editors write *οὐ τινι*.

*δεῖδω μὴ οὐ τις*, 39. Dr. Leaf notes, "the only case of *μὴ οὐ* after a verb of fearing in Homer; no other instance is found till Euripides (*M. and T.* §§ 264, 365)." The combination is infrequent in Homer (*H.G.* 255). The cases are A 28, 566, E 233, O 164, Π 128, Ω 569, 584. They are all much of a type, although it is true that only in K does *μὴ οὐ* come after a verb of fearing *expressed*. If A 28 and 566, which Delbrück distinguished, though they seem to be identical (*M. and T.* 91, Am.-H. *Anh.* to A 26, and Lieberkühn, *De conjunctis negationibus MH OT*, 3), are to be considered independent and not dependent clauses, and we translate (A 28) "beware lest the staff and fillet avail thee not," then we have good support for K. Goodwin inclines to the latter view, but Am.-H. differ. Let the learned decide. Lieberkühn, *op. cit.*, holds that the usage with verbs *verendi cavendique* is established for Homer. It would appear to be hard to take any difference there may be in this respect between A and K as indicating an interval of time between them.

*Optatives*,—in 211, 247, and 557. On 247 Dr. Monro notes, "*νοστήσαιμεν*, 'we may return,' a rare use of the opt. without *ἄν* or *κεν*: cf. 1. 557. The use seems characteristic of this book." As to 211, the MS. evidence is divided (Leaf, *a.l.*), and so are the editors. Out of 18 editions which I have consulted, 12 give *τε* instead of *κε*. The Leyden editors read *ταῦτ' εἰ πάντα*. This case must be excluded from consideration. As to the other two, the enumerations given by the authorities shew that, though

the usage is rare, there are a number of other instances in the poems. See *H.G.* 272 f.; Kühner-Gerth, i. 225 f.; *M. and T.* 80; and LaRoche, school edition of the *Iliad*, on K 557. It may be added, as to the case in 557, that in 556 Nauck has conjectured κ' for γ'. There is no MS. authority, but in γ 231, where the first half of 556 is repeated, two MSS. have κ'. See Wecklein, *Textkrit.* 65 f. He would insert κε in most of the passages in the poems. Even in K 247 he would read *τούτου κε σπομένοι* for *τούτου γ' ἐσπομένοι*. It certainly looks as if, as he says, the usage without κεν is questionable for Homer. See also Mr. Agar on γ 231.

These are the really heinous peculiarities of the language of K. It does not appear, when the opinions of the authorities are set out and duly weighed, that much is left which can with certainty be carried to its discredit. As for the *minora*, some of which have been discussed in Chap. VII. and others catalogued in App. G, they seem to be hardly worthy of serious consideration.

## CHAPTER IX

### THE PREPOSITIONS

IT is asserted that there are peculiar uses of certain prepositions in K, that the uses are common to K and the other Odyssean books of the *Iliad*, and that elsewhere they are found only in the *Odyssey*. The complaint against K in particular is given by Dr. Monro, in his *Introduction* to the Book, in these words,—“the Prepositions have a more *abstract* meaning.” See also Kuhlbars’ work, p. 18.

ἐπί. “The instances in which *extent* (without *motion*) is implied are chiefly found in the *Odyssey*” (*H.G.* 181). Instances are found in the Odyssean books of the *Iliad* also,—K 213, μέγα κέν οἱ ἐπουράνιον κλέος εἴη πάντας ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους, I 506, Ψ 742, Ω 202, 535. In the last the preposition may be *in tmesi* (Leaf on T 35).

The case does not seem to be fairly stated. Dr. Monro commences by saying that the meaning *over* with verbs of motion is very common, and adds “also with verbs of looking.” He then proceeds to cases of “*extent without motion*.” But surely the cases of looking are cases of extent without motion. And if we are to attach to the category of motion verbs of looking, why not verbs of shining, as in γ 2 f., φαείνοι ἐπὶ ζείδωρον ἄρουραν? And if the phenomena of sight, why not those of sound, as in β 421, of a wind κελάδοντ’ ἐπὶ οῖνοπα πόντον, or in K 213 and Ω 201 f., quoted above, of fame spreading through mankind? If it be said that in cases of looking a sort of motion over space is implied, then surely the same indulgence can be claimed for the uses impugned in the “Odyssean” books. *Motus facile suppletur* (Ebel. s.v.). In I 506 there is something more than mere implication in the use of the words ὑπεκπροθέει and φθάνει.

And the usage is not confined to these four books of the *Iliad*.

Other examples are B 308, δράκων ἐπὶ νῶτα δαφοινός (*über den Rücken hin*, Nägelsbach), and 765, σταφύλῃ ἐπὶ νῶτον ἔσας, H 446, ἡ ρά τίς ἔστι βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν, Θ 553 f., ἐπὶ πτολέμου γεφύρας ἥπατο, and perhaps Γ 113, ὑππους μὲν ἔρυξαν ἐπὶ στίχας, for which see Nägelsbach, *a.l.* Perhaps also P 368, if ἐπὶ θ' ὅσσον, which Dr. Leaf says most editors read, is correct. See Dr. Monro, *a.l.* The use in ὅρσασ' ἀργαλέων ἀνέμων ἐπὶ πόντον ἀγτας, Ξ 254, may be doubtful. Some commentators, as Am.-H. on A 350, even take θῖν' in ἔζετο θῖν' ἐφ' ἄλδος πολιῆς as = θῖνα, like Aristophanes' ἐπὶ βάρβαρον ἔζομένη πέταλον (*Ran.* 682). In P 447 = σ 131, ὅσσα τε γαῖαν ἔπι πνείει τε καὶ ἔρπει, there is motion in ἔρπει, but not in πνείει which is the nearer verb. μείνατ' ἐπὶ χρόνου, B 299, is a very similar use, “over a space of time,” just as “night is often regarded as a *space of darkness*” (*H.G.* 183). On the whole the distinction seems to have no real basis.

And the “peculiarity” is not confined to ἐπί. There is a similar use of ὑπό. See *H.G.* 182, and add to the examples of “extent under,”—which are not confined to the “Odyssean” books,—E 267, ὑππων, ὕσσοι ἔασιν ὑπ' ἡῶ τ' ἡλιόν τε. Cf. LaRoche, *Gebrauch von ὑπό bei Homer*, 8 f., and a note, on the point under discussion, by Nägelsbach on A 463. So for παρά (*H.G.* 176). Motion is implied and the acc. is used, though the verbs are not verbs of motion, as Λ 314, παρ' ἔμ' ὕστασο, or Τ 49, στᾶσ' ὅτε μὲν παρὰ τάφρον ὀρυκτήν. For the reverse case, with ἐπί itself, see *H.G.* 180. ἐπί with the dat. is usually = *at, upon*, but it can take the dat. with verbs of motion, as Δ 251, 273. So for προτί, *H.G.* 184. All such cases exemplify the wonderful flexibility of Homeric language and syntax, and, it may be added, the extraordinary freedom admitted in epic practice to assist the adaptation of the diction to the requirements of the hexameter.

**Ἒξ.** In *H.G.* 191, two occurrences in K with a more “abstract meaning,”—107, ἐκ χόλου ἀργαλέοιο μεταστρέψῃ φίλον ἥτορ, and 68, πατρόθεν ἐκ γενεῆς ὀνομάζων, are quoted by Dr. Monro under his last class of uses, “with an abstract word.” But the mere use with an abstract word is nothing. Immediately above in his enumeration we find ἐκ νεότητος quoted from Ξ 86. *νεότης* is not less of an *abstractum* than *χόλος* or *γενεύ*. As to ἐκ χόλου, it does not appear whether he translates “from his

wrath," which seems bad with *μεταστρέψῃ*, or "after his wrath." The latter is given by Ebel. s.v., who quotes T 290, E 865, and N 493 (Aristarchus' view), in all of which, it may be noticed, the use is with *abstracta*. As to *ἐκ γενῆς*, the meaning appears to be "with reference to," *secundum*, and it may be admitted it is a solitary use. But it is not solitariness that is objected to. It is the use of *ἐκ* with *abstracta*, and that we have seen can be paralleled outside I, K, Ψ, Ω. Of one other use of *ἐκ*, = "in consequence of," Dr. Monro says (*Odyssey*, p. 332; cf. *H.G.* 191) it is found in the *Odyssey* and I 566. But there is a case (Ebel. s.v.) in the *Mēnis*, Λ 308.

*ἐν*. Also said to have a more abstract meaning in K, which contains two instances of the departures, "nearly confined in the *Iliad* to I, K, Ψ, Ω," from the strictly local sense (*H.G.* 189). These are:—

1. "With abstract words," *ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοισι*, K 245, 279. Dr. Monro quotes cases from the other Odyssean books. But there are more, as *ἐν μοίρῃ*, T 186, *αἰση* *ἐν ἀργαλέῃ*, X 61, *ἐν φιλότητι*, frequent, and *ἐν δαιθ'*, Δ 259, "on the occasion of a banquet." But what, it may be asked, was the poet to do when the noun was in the singular? *μετά* was barred (*H.G.* 178, and Leaf on O 118). What other preposition could he use?

2. "With plurals denoting persons = *μετά*, among," as *ἢ κατ' αἰσαν ἔειπον* *ἐν ὑμῖν*, K 445, and other cases quoted from I, Ψ, and the *Odyssey*. K 127, 435 might have been included. Miss Stawell has shewn (*H. and P.* 263 ff.) that instances are numerous in other books of the *Iliad*. But her conclusions have been questioned (*Nation*, 9th Oct. 1909) by Professor Murray, who rejects her demonstration altogether. His method is the one referred to briefly, p. 19 *supra*. As regards both the classes of uses of *ἐν* now under reference, I have endeavoured to shew (*C.Q.* Oct. 1910) that the grounds on which he seeks to discredit the lines in which the principal cases in other books of the *Iliad* occur, are insufficient.

*διὰ νύκτα*. The phrase is said (*H.G.* 188) to occur "chiefly in the *Odyssey*, and K and Ω of the *Iliad*." See Miss Stawell, 262 f. The combination occurs once in B, thrice in Ω, and nine times in K. Miss Stawell calls it "a marked trick of K." But any one who reads her explanation of the phrase,—which

follows Monro's (*l.c.*; cf. 183, "but night is often regarded as a space of darkness"), and reflects that διὰ νύκτα is appropriate to movement in the open, and further that the whole of the action in K is under the sky, while only a very limited part of that of Ω is, will see at once that the authors of K and Ω are, in this matter, in exactly the same case. The spatial sense could be denied to only one of the nine cases in K, 101, but even there the movement of the Trojans through the dark to make an attack is obviously implied. And it is not strange that K and Ω, which are the only two parts of the *Iliad*, besides a few lines in I, which describe movements in the dark, should employ phrases which recur only in parts of the *Odyssey* devoted to description of the same kind. One must expect in such cases the same wording and the same grammatical constructions. It may be added that ἀνὰ νύκτα is once used, Ξ 80, perhaps because the poet wished to employ οὐδέ, as better than the bare οὐ in οὐ διὰ νύκτα would have been. Van Herwerden, in *Mnemos.* xviii. 37, actually objects to the reading there because διὰ νύκτα is the regular expression in the poems.—The distribution of the phrase is no more peculiar than that of διὰ δώματα, *Il.* 1, *Od.* frequent.

πρό. The temporal use, as in K 224, καὶ τε πρὸ ὁ τοῦ ἐνόησεν, "before the other," is noted (*H.G.* 192) as "rare in Homer." Only this passage and two from the *Odyssey* are quoted. The translation, however, is uncertain. Others render "for, on behalf of, the other." So Ebel. *s.v.*, and Hoch, *Q.L.* 21.

This is the proof from prepositions that K is late and Odyssean. It is not strong. But observe that K has prepositional uses which attach it to the *Iliad* and separate it from the *Odyssey*. Thus K 298 is quoted, *H.G.* 186, as a use of ἀνά "peculiar to the *Iliad*." The use of ἐπί with persons = "towards," "in quest of," is (*ibid.* 180) "almost confined to the *Iliad*,"—and it occurs four times in K. The use of περί in K 240 seems to be confined to the *Iliad* (*ibid.* 173). The uses of prepositions, therefore, prove K Iliadic as well as Odyssean (*C.Q.* iv. 77).

The departures in the poems from the rules and standards by which criticism, ancient and modern, seeks to regulate their language, are numerous. Genius is superior to such clogs on free expression. See p. 223 *infra*. Exceptional uses of prepositions are common. Nevertheless they have played their part

in Dissecting treatises. Giseke (*Entstg.*) essayed to employ them (along with certain metrical phenomena) as a criterion on an extensive scale, and K, like many other books, was shewn to be full of remarkable uses; so much so, that we must say once more that its author was trying to shew how far he could differ from his brother bards. But Giseke's labours and results have not been seriously regarded. Groupings of parts of the poems on such criteria *prorsus inter se repugnant* (Buchholz, *Vindic.* 77 ff.; cf. Ilg, *Hom. Krit.* 19 f.). G. Curtius (*Andeutgn.* 34) thinks that many of Giseke's distinctions are arbitrary and based on subjective appreciation. The origin of prepositions from adverbs would, Curtius holds, be the only proper basis for such an enquiry. Giseke himself does admit (*op. cit.* 95; cf. Wetzel, *De recent. Choriz. stud.* 9) that difference of subject must have its influence, but sometimes neglects the point (Curtius, *l.c.*, on  $\epsilon\kappa\pi\omega\lambda\mu\omega\nu$ ). It is a consideration which cannot be disregarded. Compare  $\delta\iota\alpha\pi\nu\kappa\tau\alpha$ , discussed above.

Metrical convenience does not appear to be mentioned by Giseke. It also cannot be disregarded in this connection. See pp. 53 f. *supra*. Sometimes  $\epsilon\nu$  could be used and not  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$ ; sometimes  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$  and not  $\epsilon\nu$ . The author of K is blamed for using  $\epsilon\nu$  with a plural, 127, 435, and 445. But it is only because  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$ , which he knows and uses in 62 and 250, did not suit (*C.Q.* iv. 78). An examination, from the Concordances, of the occurrences of  $\epsilon\nu(i)$   $\phi\epsilon\sigma\iota(v)$  and  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\phi\epsilon\sigma\iota(v)$  is an instructive exercise. It is metrical convenience that determines the choice between them. Compare, e.g., Ψ 600 with δ 548 f., or A 297 with I 434 f. So for  $\epsilon\nu\pi\rho\omega\tau\omega\iota\omega\iota$  and  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\pi\rho\omega\tau\omega\iota\omega\iota$ , for which and for  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$  and  $\alpha\pi\alpha$   $\theta\mu\mu\omega\omega$  see Düntzer's reply (*H.A.* 549 ff.) to Ameis. Dr. Monro's note on π 419 ( $\mu\epsilon\theta'\bar{\omega}\mu\bar{\eta}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\iota}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\alpha}\bar{s}$ ) is a good example of this explanation of a rare use. See also *H.G.* 182, on  $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\nu}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\alpha}\bar{v}$   $\bar{\nu}\bar{\phi}'\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\iota}$ , Σ 244, and *ibid.* 188, on  $\delta\iota\alpha\pi\pi\bar{\nu}\bar{\chi}\bar{\alpha}\bar{s}$ , H 247.  $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\tau}\bar{\omega}\bar{\nu}$  and  $\pi\pi\bar{\nu}\bar{\chi}\bar{\hat{\omega}}\bar{\nu}$  were metrically impossible. So (*ibid.* 149)  $\delta'i\bar{\delta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\sigma}\bar{\phi}\bar{\iota}$ , K 185, for  $\delta'i\bar{\delta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\omega}\bar{\nu}$ .

We think it is clear that Odyssean connection is not to be inferred from prepositional uses in K.

## CHAPTER X

### THE ARTICLE

THE Homeric Article, like almost everything else in or connected with the poems, has been the subject of great controversy. There were differences even in Alexandrian days. In recent times *pugna extitit haud minus atrox atque vehemens quam de origine compositioneque Iliadis et Odysseae*.<sup>1</sup> There has been diversity of view as to the development of the pronoun *ó* into the fully fledged Article. The common view that it became first a demonstrative adj. and then an Article is questioned by Brugmann (*Gr. Gram.* 425). The still commoner view that it was originally a demonstrative pronoun has been disputed by Förstemann (*op. cit.* 3). As to uses, some, as Ameis, have contended that there is no Article in the poems, *ó* being always pronominal. The majority accept, in varying degrees, a *verus sincerusque articulus*. As to classification of uses and shades of significance, the diversity of opinion is quite remarkable.

The view that there is no Article in the poems may be said to be extinct. It relied mainly on excision and emendation. But van Leeuwen characterises the scheme as "intolerably audacious" (*Ench.* 264). Where excision and emendation both failed, the only resource was to force the meaning. But such renderings as Ameis' *das (was wir jetzt sehen)*, *nämlich das schlechtere*, for  $\tau\alpha \chi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\omega\alpha$ , A 576,—the Homeric for "bad form,"—are too much for most critics. See Koch, p. 24. They are "ingenious,

<sup>1</sup> Koch, *De articulo Homericō*, Leipzig, 1872. The two other special monographs used are Förstemann's *Bemerkn. üb. d. Gebrauch d. Artikels bei Hom.*, Magdeburg, 1861, and Stummer's *Üb. den Artikel bei Hom.*, Schweinfurt, 1886.—Since this chapter was completed, Professor Postgate has

kindly referred me to his remarks on the Homeric Article in his paper on *Flaws in Classical Research*, reprinted from *Procs. of Brit. Acad.* iii. I am glad to be able to add some references from his very clear and useful statement of the case.

forced interpretations" (Kuhl, *Bedtg. des Accentes im Hom.* 2). Mr. Agar (p. 343) considers "it, the tunic" as a rendering of  $\tauὸν \chiιτῶνα$ , τ 232, "utterly inane." Krüger (*Griech. Sprachl.* ii. 2, 65 f.) observes that by this process the Article might be removed from Attic prose.

But it is worth noting that this method of interpretation is still followed by high authorities. Thus, *Τρώων τὸν ἄριστον = ihn, den tapfersten* (Kühner-Gerth, i. 577); *τοῦ πατρός = "him, her father"* (M. and R. on β 134). In *ἀνίη καὶ τὸ φυλάσσειν*, ν 52, we take, at first sight, the connection between *τό* and *φυλάσσειν* to be one that no man could put asunder. But Nägelsbach explained it by *ἀνίη καὶ τοῦτο, φυλάσσειν*, and Kühner-Gerth (i. 579) and Brugmann (*Gr. Gram.* 425) approve. And see *H.G.* 228. I need not criticise these judgments, but I claim that the same measure be meted out to K. Do not deny the possibility of "it, the omen," or "it (the bird), as an omen," for *τῷ ὅρνιθ'*, K 277, or of "he, the bold Odysseus," for *ὁ τλήμων Ὀδυσσεύς*, K 498 (Brugmann, *l.c.*). Do not let prejudice against K make "the" the only possible rendering in such cases, if the alternative rendering is admissible elsewhere.

Scholars then are satisfied that there is an Article in the poems, but at the same time that *ὁ* is also used, both as pronoun and as adjective, with its old demonstrative force. But different schools interpret the phenomena in different ways. To the Dissector the Article is *im werden* (Fürstemann, 1), *quasi nascens* (Koch, 3), and he sees confirmation of his theory of a gradual growth of the poems. In the earliest days, when the first lay of the *Iliad* was composed, he finds there was no Article, though there was already a weakening of the pronoun. But three or four centuries later, when the last addition was stitched on to the poems by the latest *ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων ἀοιδός*, it was not far from the Attic Article. A critic can test the age of a passage by a *τοῦ* or a *τῆς*. The Unitarian, on the other hand, finds nothing in the use of *ὁ* to militate against his belief that the poems are the product of one age. It was, he thinks, an age in which an Article had been developed, not in all the matured uses of Attic prose, but in some of them, while the old uses of the pronoun had not altogether died out.

How are we to decide? We get no help from the statistics in the special treatises. Like so many other Homeric works,

they spoil things for themselves at the outset by assuming late tracts and early in the poems. Stummer sums up (p. 56) very elaborate calculations as follows. In his older parts of the *Iliad* the genuine Article is found once in every 72 lines. In the younger parts the proportion is the same. In the older parts of the *Odyssey* it is 1 in 74. In the younger parts it is 1 in 68. The results are neither consistent nor striking. And of course different results would be produced by any one taking different limits for late and early. Stummer himself is driven, by the failure of his statistics, to explain that the later authors made the earlier lays their models in respect of language. Then *cadit quaestio*. For there will be no difference of usage left to consider.

Another reason for disregarding these statistical results is the uncertainty of the text. Modernisation caused the interchange of small words. It was only natural for copyists and editors, accustomed to the Article, to substitute it, deliberately or through oversight, in many of the hundreds of cases in which Attic usage required it. The commentaries abound with examples of alternative readings, either transmitted in the tradition, or suggested, with general acceptance, by modern editors. Some well-known instances are  $\tau\grave{a}$  à (éFà) κῆλα, M 280, ήείδης τὸν (ήείδησθα) ἐμόν, X 280, ἐν δὲ τὰ (τε) τείρεα, Σ 485, θάλαμον τόν (θάλα-μόνδε), φ 42, τὴν (ἐν, τῇ) δὲ γυναικα, κ 112, τὸ σῆμα (τόδ' ήμα, Agar), θ 195, ἄριστος (òs or ὅχ' ἄριστος). The MSS. waver between δ' ó γέρων and δὲ γέρων. And so on. Bare statistics are dangerous guides. See the conclusion in Dr. Merry's school edition of *a-μ*, pt. ii. 14.

If statistics are to be relied on, they should at least be of classified uses. But then there is the difficulty that the classification will not be accepted by everybody. Classifications differ. It is almost "impossible to establish definite rules" (Merry, *ut sup.*). This applies to Miss Stawell's very full statement (*op. cit.* 276 ff.). It follows the *H.G.* It would be easy to criticise the arrangement of classes. For one thing, that "Article of Contrast" is a very doubtful quantity (p. 85 *infra*). But taking the statement as it stands, there is nothing in it unfavourable to K. Even if K be Odyssean, the imputation amounts to nothing, for Miss Stawell shews that the Articular difference between the two poems is almost *nil*. She also vindicates Ψ and Ω. But what of I and K? It seems to me

that, on the evidence, I is more entitled to a place in her “original *Iliad*” than either Ψ or Ω. And as for K, the figures for it correspond almost exactly with those compiled for A. Miss Stawell adds, as the only point against K, that its instances shew “a great variety of type.” No particulars are given, and I cannot see that there is any greater variety than A displays. But a stronger point—in favour of K—is that there are in A high uses of the genuine Attic Article which cannot be paralleled in K (p. 86 *infra*).

In view of the great diversity of opinion that prevails on so many points, the only feasible plan seems to be to take the Articular occurrences in K *seriatim*, see what the learned have to say about them, decide as best we can, on these deliverances, as to the residuum of real Articular uses in the Book, and having got it, compare it with the same in first, an admittedly early part, such as A, and secondly, some other late area.

Düntzer, as he denies the Article to the poems, does not refer to it in his case against K, and Orszulik barely mentions it. But two English editors, Drs. Monro and Leaf, give it a conspicuous place in their Introductions to the Book. See also the *H.G.* 234, and, more recently, Bechtel, *Vocalcontr.* 3 f.

Taking the occurrences in detail, there are, in the first place, some in which there is a *v.l.*, or where the text has been amended, though generally the vulgate can stand without detriment to K.

*φαινομένων τὸν ἄριστον*, 236, is discussed, p. 235 *infra*.

πῶς δ' αἱ τῶν ἄλλων Τρώων φυλακαί; 408. Aristarchus read πῶς δαί, which is printed by LaRoche, Stier, Leaf, and Fick. See Lehrs, *Ar.* 354, and Ludwich, *Ar.* i. 319, and cf. M. and R. on *a* 225 (crit. note). Bothe long ago suggested πῶς δ' αῦ as more Homeric. He observes that the letters *i* and *u* are easily confused. Others, as Kühner-Gerth, i. 580, class the use with *τὸ σὸν γέρας* and *τὸ σὸν μένος*, both in A,—a common use which Dr. Leaf (on X 280) admits can hardly be expelled from “the most ancient passages.”

ἢ ἔτι τῶν πλεόνων Θρῆκῶν, 506. Nauck's ἢ δ' γ' ἔτι πλεόνων may be original. See p. 232 *infra*. But the Article with a compar. is a common use (Leaf, *a.l.*, quoting the *H.G.*). Dr. Monro translates “should slay instead more Thracians.” Am.-H., *der Mehrzahl*, and Pierron, *ex istis pluribus*. We need

not question the use of  $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$  or amend, though Dr. Leaf (on E 673) thinks Nauck's reading, and Heyne's,  $\eta\circ\gamma\epsilon\kappa\lambda\pi\lambda\epsilon\acute{o}\nu\omega\nu$ , "sound more Homeric." He refers to E 679. We might add Π 651 and Φ 211.

$\circ\tau\lambda\acute{\eta}\mu\omega\nu$  ( $\pi\tau\omega\lambda\acute{i}\pi\tau\omega\theta\circ\sigma$ ) 'Οδυσ(σ)εύς, 231, 498, 363, and  $\circ\kappa\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\circ\Delta\iota\omega\mu\acute{h}\delta\eta\circ$ , 536, said by some to be late uses. There are 8 other cases of the same or a very similar kind in the poems,—B 278, T 320, κ 436, ψ 306, Θ 532, Λ 660, and Π 25, 358. In all 12 cases the smallest possible change, as by the omission of the  $\circ$ , or writing  $\delta\acute{e}$  or  $\eta\acute{d}\acute{e}$  or  $\ddot{a}pa$  in full, gets rid of the Article. Is this chance, or is the Article due to modernisation? Some would say the latter. Mr. Agar (65 ff., 286 ff.) has purged the *Odyssey* of the Article with  $\eta\acute{h}\sigma\circ\sigma$ ,  $\chi\hat{\omega}\rho\circ\sigma$ ,  $\xi\acute{e}\iota\omega\circ\sigma$ . But see Professor Postgate's paper, 18 f. and note on 19. The MSS. give some support, for in B 278, K 363, ψ 306, a few omit the Article. See Leaf on Π 358 and Agar on κ 436.

But have we necessarily the genuine Article in these cases? They seem to differ very little from the type in Ψ 303 ( $\tau\circ\upsilon\text{Ν}\eta\lambda\eta\acute{\iota}\acute{a}\delta\alpha\circ$ ), Λ 614, λ 519, N 698, where demonstr. force may be claimed. Pierron (on K 498) renders  $\circ\tau\lambda\acute{\eta}\mu\omega\nu$  by *l'illustre*; Paley (on B 278),  $\circ\pi\tau\omega\lambda\acute{i}\pi\tau\omega\theta\circ\sigma$  by "he, the city-reiving." Dr. Leaf (on Τ 147,  $\tau\circ\kappa\acute{h}\tau\circ\sigma$ , on which see Professor Postgate, p. 16 of his paper) notes that the use is confined to late passages. But surely  $\tau\circ\upsilon\text{Χ}\rho\acute{u}\sigma\eta\circ$ , A 11, was overlooked. Whether we take this as *jenen im troischen Sagenkreise bekannten* (Nägelsb.) or as an approach to the Attic  $\tau\circ\upsilon\text{K}\acute{u}\rho\circ\sigma$ , there it is embedded deep in the *Ur-Ilias*. If we are to amend there or in other passages of the *Mēnis* quoted above,—Λ 660, Π 25, 358, then we claim the right to amend in K. If all stand, K has good, ancient support. That the cases are numerous in K, is not a difficulty. Odysseus and Diomede play a very large part in it, and ten of the twelve occurrences in the poems concern those heroes. And lastly, if the occurrences in K are a sign that they were written when the author could not get away from the newly developed Article, we cannot understand why other Odyssean authors could avoid writing  $\ddot{a}\rho\theta'\circ$  in Ψ 290, 293, θ 3.

Classes of cases common in the poems require no special reference, as  $\circ\gamma\acute{e}\rho\omega\nu$ ,  $\tau\circ\pi\acute{a}\rho\circ\sigma$ , and cases with a possessive, as  $\tau\circ\delta'\acute{e}\acute{o}\nu$ , 256,—for which see p. 80 *supra*. So for cases with

a comparative or a superlative, as *τὸν μὲν ἀρείω*, 237, and *οἱ ἄριστοι*, 539. Even if the latter be taken to mean "the bravest (generally)," we could refer to Δ 260, Ζ 435, Λ 658, and Ν 128, not all late passages. But in the occurrence in K it seems that the translation should be "those heroes (just mentioned)."

And in the following cases it will not be disputed that we have demonstrative uses. *τῶν πάντων*, 215, *de tous ceux-là* (Pierron). *τὸν τρισκαιδέκατον*, 495, 561: "him for the thirteenth" (Monro), *illum qui fuit decimus tertius* (Pierron). *τὸν μὲν δὴ ἔταρόν γ' αἰρήσει*, 235: "him or that one as companion." *τὸν δέ σφιν ἄνακτα*, 559: *ihn aber ihren Herren* (Am.-H.).

Two cases, *τῶν δύο μοιράων*, 253, and *τὴν νύκτα*, 497, occur in lines which are generally suspected, but we do not think they should be excised (pp. 223, 226 *infra*). And there appears to be nothing exceptional in either. The first is the common use before "a Cardinal Numeral, when a division is made" (H.G. 228), as here between two parts of the night and a third. *τὴν νύκτα* is one of Dr. Monro's bad cases (H.G. 234, and his note *a.l.*, "'for that night.' But neither the Article nor the Acc. of duration is in place here. This line is probably spurious"). But how is one to translate "that night" and at the same time say that *τὴν* is the Article? Surely it is demonstrative. The use of *τὴν νύκτα* to mean "in the night" or "at night" (which would be *νυκτός* as in ν 278) would be somewhat absurd. We know well it was night. It must mean "during that night." So it is taken by Am.-H., *während jener Nacht*, as by Pierron, *cette nuit-là*. *En prose ταύτην τὴν νύκτα*, *illa nocte*, and by Bothe. So indeed in the translation by Dr. Monro himself.

The remaining cases are all specified in H.G. 230, 234, as bad examples of late usage.

*ἡ τοι ὅτ' ἐς πεδίον τὸ Τρωϊκὸν ἀθρήσει*, 11. Kühner-Gerth (i. 580) agree that this is an Attic use, but only one of many such in the poems. Attic or not, it seems to have good support, as *πεδίον τὸ Ἀλγῆον*, Ζ 201, *τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος*, Β 681, and *θεοὺς τοὺς ὑποταρταρίους*, Ξ 279. *Θάμυριν τὸν Θρῆικα*, Β 595, and the group of expressions, already discussed, of the type *τῷ Ἀσκληπιαδῇ*, are not very different. LaRoche, *a.l.*, refers for illustration to *ἀνὴρ ὄριστος*, Λ 288, and *ἄντυγες αἱ περὶ δίφρου*, Λ 535 = Τ 500. Cf. also *ἰχθύες οἱ κατὰ δίνας*,

Φ 353. In these passages Dr. Monro, Dr. Leaf and Mr. Platt take *aī* and *oī* as the relative, a change which does not seem to be for the better, and which is not accepted in nine other editions which I have consulted. The phrase in our passage recurs in Ψ 464, without the *τό*, *Τρωϊκὸν ἀμ πεδίον*, though Ψ, as a late book, should have a weakness for the Article. In *πεδίον Σκαμάνδριον*, B 465, and *'Ηλύσιον πεδίον*, δ 563, *τό* could not be inserted. The metre influenced the use of the Article.

*δεῦρ' ἐς τοὺς φύλακας καταβήσομεν*, 97. *Exultato importunus articulus, scribitorque δεῦρο δὴ ἐς φύλακας, ut χ 395, δεῦρο δὴ ὅρσο* (van Herwerden in *Mnemos.* xix. 163). (It may be added that in Hes. *Opp.* 2, *δεῦτε δή* is given by most MSS. for *δεῦτε, Δέ*. See Paley and Rzach, *a.l.*) Copyists would easily insert an Attic Article (Stummer, 13, 37, etc., and Agar, *passim*). It is worth noticing that a similar change in Ψ 485 would get rid of *vuv* in the temporal sense,—the only case in the poems except that alleged in K 105 (p. 233 *infra*). Some defend *τούς* as deictic, for which see M. and R. on *a* 359, and cf. Bréal, 180; *ce supplément de clarté que donne le geste*. So for *οὗτος*,—*crebro δεικτικῶς* (Lehrs, *Ar.* 51). Add Kühner-Gerth, i. 641, quoting Nitzsch on *a* 185—*den sprechenden Homer muss man sprechen, nicht lesen*. The gesture in our case is perhaps implied by *δεῦρο*, “down to the guards yonder” (Stummer, 22, and Vogrinz, 198). Am.-H. take *τούς* as the pronoun, “them, the guards.” But it is better to accept the insertion of the Article. The author of K uses *φύλακες* without the Article, in the undoubted sense of our “the guards,” six times. Had he been a late poet with late ways, he would surely have betrayed his late origin in more than one of the seven uses. Fick’s *δεῦρο μετὰ φύλακας* does not seem good.

*χαῖρε δὲ τῷ ὅρνιθ' Ὀδυσσεύς*, 277. “At the omen of the bird” (Monro, *a.l.*). But why not “at that omen,” *hoc oscine* (Stier), *über dieses Vogelzeichen* (LaR. and Henke)? The use is surely demonstr., as in *τοῦ βασιλῆος ἀπηνέος*, A 340, or *τὸν ὅρκον*, β 378, “that oath of hers” (M. and R.).

*τὸ σκῆπτρον ἀνάσχεο*, 321. “The sceptre,”—“the defining Article of later Greek” (*H.G.* 230). Dr. Leaf, however, translates “this sceptre,” which Dolon holds “as in possession of the house.” But that is doubtful, for the gathering is informal.

(For another explanation, see *C.R.* xx. 205.) LaRoche and Pierron both give "this sceptre," the latter thinking that Hector has it in his hand. But 328 shews that Hector was not holding the sceptre while Dolon was speaking. He takes it in his hands when Dolon is done, and, as it is not said that he got it from Dolon, it may have been conceived by the poet as lying beside Hector or held by an attendant. In any case Dolon's request is probably made *δεικτικῶς*, and the best translation seems to be, with Am.-H., "the sceptre there" (*τό hinweisend*). There is no need to assume the late Article. See Professor Postgate, p. 16, on *τὸ σκῆπτρον* in H 412.

*καὶ μοι ὅμοσσον ἦ μὲν τοὺς ἵππους . . . δωσέμεν, οὐ φορέοντιν . . .* 321 ff, and *μὴ μὲν τοῖς ἵπποισιν ἀνὴρ ἐποχήσεται ἄλλος*, 330. These two seem to be the weakest of all Dr. Monro's serious cases. As regards the first, if authority for the demonstr. view is required, see Kühner-Gerth (i. 578) and Krüger (*Sprachl.* ii. 2, 63). Paley says *τούς = ἔκείνους*, and Am.-H. render *jenen, den* 322 f. *bezeichneten*, just as in a note *a.l.* Dr. Monro himself on the other case, *τοῖς ἵπποισιν*, says "that chariot, Art. referring to l. 322." His objection in the case of *τοὺς ἵππους* seems unintelligible, except on the assumption that *ὁ* is the Article if it can be rendered in English by "the." But even "the" varies much in signification. In "the house that Jack built" it is only a weaker "that,"—Professor Postgate's "intermediate Article." In "hold thou the good," it is the Article in its highest use. For an Articular use in *τοῖς ἵπποισιν* nothing can be said. Miss Stawell, I observe, does not even include it in her enumeration. Professor Postgate remarks that "if ever there was a passage in which solemn emphasis was expressed by article or pronoun adjective," it is this one.

In estimating the results of this detailed survey, attention may be confined to Dr. Monro's seven bad cases. Three, *τοὺς ἵππους*, 322, *τοῖς ἵπποισιν*, 330, and *τῷ ὅρνιθ'*, 277, may be disallowed at once, and *ai τῶν ἄλλων φυλακατ*, 408, as the reading is much too doubtful. There remain three, about which opinions will differ,—the *ὁ τλήμων* group, *τὸ Τρωϊκόν*, 11, and *τοὺς φύλακας*, 97. The last, if allowed to stand, is the worst of all. The others have numerous parallels in the poems, and some will believe that the *ὁ τλήμων* set were never so written at all. The residuum of the Article in Attic uses is very trifling in

amount. There is not one instance of the late Article in its highest use.

Now let us turn to other parts of the poems. If Dissectors are right, other late parts should be as full of late Articular uses as K's enemies say it is. A very early part should be absolutely free of them.

We begin with A, supposed to have been composed in days when Greek did not yet know the Article. We omit from consideration, as before, all stock cases, *τὰ πρῶτα*, *οἱ γέρων*, and the like, and some debatable cases as *τὰ δὲ ἄποινα*, 20, and *τὸ μὲν πλεῖον*, 165, and fix our attention on these,—*τὸν Χρύσην*, 11, *τὸ γέρας*, 167, *τῇ δεκάτῃ*, 54, *τὰ τ’ ἔόντα τὰ τ’ ἐσσόμενα*, 70, *τὸ κρήγυον*, 106, *τὰ κάκ’*, 107, and *τὰ χερείονα*, 576. They constitute a black list as formidable as Dr. Monro's for K, and they can hardly be reduced by emendation or manipulation. Dr. Leaf is silent regarding most of them. He admits that *τὸν Χρύσην* is hardly to be paralleled in Homer. *τὸ γέρας* is explained (*H.G.* 230) as a sort of “defining Article,” the whole phrase *σοὶ τὸ γέρας* being = *τὸ σὸν γέρας*. It seems very doubtful if the explanation is good, and better with Paley, *a.l.*, to recognise “the ordinary use of the Article.” In *τῇ δεκάτῃ* again, how are we to refuse a real Articular use? It seems the exact equivalent of our “on the tenth (day).” The remaining cases—*τὰ τ’ ἔόντα*, etc., are all of a stamp, and surely uses of the Article in one of its highest later developments. Dr. Monro explains them (*H.G.* 228 f.) as a form of his Article of Contrast, “expressing the standing contrasts of great and small, many and few, good and evil, etc., especially when the contrast is brought out by the context.” When the contrast is brought out by the context, the use of the Article may be a special one, though we think even here the examples are often strained to fit a theory. A stock instance is B 217, *φολκὸς ἔην, χωλὸς δὲ ἔτερον πόδα, τὼ δέ οἱ ὥμω, κ.τ.λ.* The *H.G.* 227 (followed by Jebb, 188) translates “but then his shoulders,” in contrast to other parts of Thersites' body. But there is no contrast. Legs and shoulders are included as similar items in one damaging description. But where the contrast is not brought out by the context, what have we but the definite Article of later Greek? This element of contrast is always present in the real Article, and is the more marked the higher its use. The more complete the

"individualisation" or "actualisation" effected by the Article, the more decided the contrast with everything outside the notion or concrete fact so specialised. In one of the cases now under reference, Dr. Monro claims that there is contrast expressed, ("implied" would seem to be the more appropriate description), in the context. He says that  $\tauὸ\ κρήγυον$  is opposed to  $\tauὰ\ κάκ'$ , and that the latter expression is "quite different from the later use of  $\tauὸ\ κακόν$  or  $\tauὰ\ κακά$  for 'evil' or 'evils' in general."<sup>1</sup> But in his note *a.l.* he translates "evil is dear to you to prophesy," which seems to agree with Nägelsbach's note on  $\tauὸ\ κρήγυον$ , *statt eines concreten Einzelnen die Gattung; solches was gut ist.* We do not require a contrast, express or implied, in the context. But certainly there is no contrast expressed in  $\tauά\ τ' ἔόντα\ τά\ τ' ἐσσόμενα$ . On the contrary, the two notions are co-ordinated in one affirmation. It is difficult here, as in  $\tauὰ\ χερείονα$ , to see anything but a high use of the fully developed Article. As Nägelsbach says of  $\tauά\ τ' ἔόντα$ , "the Homeric Article is here absolutely identical with the Attic." So Kühner-Gerth, i. 579, and Kuhn, *op. cit.* 2. No attempt, so far as we know, has been made to get rid of these cases by emendation. And they are so strong that we may allow to critics of K all the damage to the Book which can be argued on  $\tauὸ\ Τρωϊκόν$  and even  $\tauοὺς\ φύλακας$ . If the Article proves K late, I think it proves A later.

We next take a passage among the very latest, the "Continuation" of the *Odyssey*,  $\psi$  297 to the end of  $\omega$ . It should be full of genuine Articular uses. On the contrary, Dr. Monro (*Odyssey*, 323), though he holds the arguments against the passage "overwhelming," notes only one instance of the later use of the Article,  $νιεῖς\ οἱ\ Δολίοι$ ,  $\omega$  497, where the *οἱ* to some critics, as Nauck, seems corrupt. And—more striking still—there is in this very late area a passage,  $\omega$  1-204, which is held to be even later. Yet there is not in it a single use of the Article that claims attention.

The *Telemachy* is also said to be very late. Kirchhoff and his followers (Jebb, 129 f.) would assign it to the author of the "Continuation," who flourished in the age (*circ. 650 B.C.*) which, according to Leaf and Jebb, gave us the Doloneia. Examining

<sup>1</sup> This is in his *Iliad*, vol. I. p. lxxii. Dr. Leaf's rendering of  $\tauὰ\ κακά$  is "those evil things of yours."

one book,  $\alpha$ , for Articular evidence of lateness, we find not one case worth noticing. If we have regard to this and to statistics for  $\alpha$  and A (Stummer, 57), we must pronounce the *Telemachy* earlier than the *Mēnis*, so far as Articular evidence goes.

Or take  $\Omega$ , which is not much higher in critical estimation than K. Peppmüller, who has left nothing unsaid that could tell against it, is of opinion (*Comment. xlivi.*) that there is in that book no essential advance in the matter of the Article, though both Koch and Förstemann had tried to prove there was. I think Miss Stawell's lists for A and  $\Omega$  shew that Peppmüller is right.

The facts then do not suit Dissectors. Books which are, in their estimation, extremely late, may shew little trace of the genuine Article. On the other hand, their *Ur-Ilias* may provide a number of high Attic uses. Their theory of an Article developing through centuries along with a growing *Iliad* and *Odyssey* seems to be negatived. Some other explanation must be sought. Miss Stawell's lists shew there are differences which are not to be explained by any theory of late and early. X and A are both *Ur-Ilias*; they differ much. So do  $\Psi$  and  $\Omega$ , which are considered Late Expansions. But such differences should not surprise us. The moods of the poet, the varying nature of the subject of his song, and the needs of the verse are enough to account for them. If we select two parts of *Paradise Lost* which have very different subjects,—as Book VII. 640 lines, and the first 640 lines of Book II.,—it will be found that the occurrences of the Definite Article in the former are very nearly double those in the latter. Krüger (*Sprachl. ii. 2*, 65 f.; and cf. Düntzer, 530, and Nägelsbach on A 6 and B 329) lays stress on metrical convenience. He observes that German poets often omit the Article in cases where, in ordinary speech, it could not be dispensed with.

Kühner-Gerth who are satisfied (i. 639 f.) that the genuine Article exists in Homer, remark on the varying frequency of its occurrences in poetry generally. Their view is that the higher the form of the poetry, and the more its descriptive style is removed from the ordinary speech of life, the more sparingly is the Article used. And the nearer the poetry is to actual life, and the closer its relation to the language of the people, the more frequent the employment of the Article. Thus

in Lyric, and in Tragedy, especially in the lyric passages, the use is rare and corresponds to epic practice. In Comedy, on the other hand, the use is akin to that in Attic prose. This appears to apply to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The Epic is the highest, the most stately of all, and Homer's the noblest of all epic poetry. In matter and language alike it is exalted above others. On Kühner-Gerth's principle we can understand his rare use of the Article, and how he became a model to his successors, not in the Epic only, but in other forms of poetry. Pindar (Kühner-Gerth, i. 582) uses the Article but seldom, but its development was, we know, complete before his day. For Tragedy and Comedy we have already given Kühner-Gerth's view.

Hesiod's case has some interest. His practice, according to Kühner-Gerth (i. 581), corresponds entirely to Homer's. But it is added that "it is striking that the pronoun nowhere appears (in Hesiod) as the real Article." That can hardly be accepted. Hesiod does use ὁ as the Article, and a careful comparison of the *Theogony* and the *Works* with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* seems to shew that there is hardly a use in either of the former that cannot be paralleled in the epics. Dr. Monro (*H.G.* 234) finds "some advance" in Hesiod. His instances are instructive. All are from the *Works*, and all except one—τῶν πρόσθεν, 457, which is unimportant—are from the second two hundred lines of the poem. Now this section is peculiar in its subject. It is didactic, like the bulk of the poem, but unlike the part that follows in this, that it is practically a collection of moral precepts. See Paley's analysis of 201-382. It reads like the *Gnomes* of Theognis, and, as in these, the use of the Article is frequent. In the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* such moralising is not common. But there is just enough to warrant us in saying that, had there been more, the higher uses of the Article must have been more frequent. It does not seem to be going too far to say that even in the *Ur-Ilias* the uses of the Article are identical with the highest in Hesiod.

The Articular phenomena in Homer require further investigation. A comparison with the poetry of other languages might help towards the explanation of the rarity and irregularity of the uses. It is noticeable how easily the Article can be omitted even in its highest applications. Though we say "hold thou

the good," we can say "avoid evil," and instead of "the fox is cunning," "foxes are cunning." In French "one says *les vins du Rhin*, but more often *les vins de Moselle*; *l'Empereur du Maroc*, but *l'Empereur de Chine*; *lettres du Portugal* and *lettres de Portugal* indifferently, but *lettres de Suède*. This means that, if the Article does not add to the phrase an entire word (*la*), it is more easy to use it.<sup>1</sup> A very high authority, Meillet, has recently (*M.S.L.* 1908, 168) commented on the absence of the Article before nouns in the Homeric poems. The reason is to be found in the epic tradition, not in the non-existence of the Article, *un élément si généralement répandu sur tout le domaine hellénique dès la date la plus ancienne*. The rarity of the Article in *Beowulf* has been noted by the commentators, as Arnold, p. xiv. of his Introduction, and Huyshe, xxxiii. The German poets, as we have seen, often omit it where it would be used in prose. It must often be inconvenient in any poetry. In the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* there is another indication of the same thing. There does not seem to be one unquestionable case in them of the use of a dissyllabic part of ὅ ή τό as the genuine Article. All the ten occurrences of τοῦτο as the Article given by Koch (p. 31) are in stock phrases of the type τοῦτο γέροντος, and need not be considered the Article. Of τοῖν there are four occurrences (p. 35,—II 644 is a mistake), all pronominal. τάων (p. 37) is everywhere demonstrative, and τοῖσι and τῆσι (p. 38) the same, the only case (χ 221) in which Koch claims τοῖσι as the Article being clearly so.

Our conclusion is that the Article existed in *Ur-Ilias* times, though not in *all* its uses afterwards familiar in Attic prose. We have suggested an explanation of the unequal distribution of occurrences through the two epics, and we have seen that the theory of an Article developing with an expanding body of poetry does not appear to consist with the phenomena. We have also seen that there is nothing more serious against K than can be urged against A. The Articular evidence does not tend to prove it late.

<sup>1</sup> *Romania*, xxviii. 294,—a review, brought to my notice by Mr. Andrew Lang, of a Swedish work on the Article. I have not had access to the work

itself, and so am unable to give fully what the author says about the *forme légère et commode de l'article*.

## CHAPTER XI

### THE PSEUDO-ARCHAISMS

THERE is one class of cases of linguistic aberration in which a specific reason can be given for the inference of lateness. A form has an archaic appearance, but is philologically impossible. The poet responsible for it was trying to reproduce the language of the men of old, but failed. As he was not scholar enough to understand the structure of the words, he succeeded in producing only what Mr. Agar calls the "sham antique." Philologists can now expose such mistakes, and critics see in them the efforts of "late imitative poets." This is another hobby which some high authorities (see *H.G.* 151, and Jebb, 137 f.) think has been ridden too hard. They believe there are fewer archaisms in the poems than is generally supposed.

A hankering after the archaic and the production of only the pseudo-archaic, is one of the faults laid to the charge of the author of K. Dr. Leaf (*Introdn.* to K) says "we seem to have pseudo-archaisms, ἐγρηγόρθασι, κράτεσφι, σφίσιν = νῦν, and perhaps παραφθαίησι." Dr Monro (*Introdn.*) gives, as "clearly pseudo-archaic," παραφθαίησι, κράτεσφι, ἐπείγετον, "perhaps also σπεῖο (for σπέο) and τιθήμενος." Jebb, *l.c.*, thinks Monro's cases "confirm the relative lateness of the book," but only with a reservation which he indicates in his general discussion of the question. Father Browne (*Handbook*, 47 ff.) does not refer to these cases in K in his section on archaisms. We may note, to begin with, what the authorities say on those mentioned.

παραφθαίησι, 346. "Meant for an Opt., the -σι being added in imitation of the Subj. in -ησι (for γ)." So Dr. Monro, *a.l.* But in *H.G.* 73 he seems doubtful, and on p. 48 he admits the possibility of a φθαίω, for which cf. *Ench.* 289 *n.*, quoting G. Meyer and J. Schmidt. Dr. Leaf, *a.l.*, holds that the form

is a "hybrid monster," which he will not impute even to the author of K, and prints *παραφθάνησι*, with some MS. support. LaRoche corrects to *παραφθήνησι*, and Fick to *παραφθάνησι*. It is perhaps best to accept *παραφθάνησι*. A scribe would know Attic *φθάνω* and would not understand Homeric *φθάνω* (from *φθανω*, *H.G.* 47, or *metri causa*, *φθάννω*, Ludwich, *Ar.* ii. 127; cf. Schulze, 109). It seems unnecessary with Curtius (*Verb*, 325) to infer "an aberration of the linguistic sense on the part of a later imitative poet." He assumes (p. 40) that K is not one of the oldest lays.

*ἐπείγετον*, 361. If a conjve., a wrong formation. If an indic., the change to *προθέησι* in the next line is harsh (Monro and Leaf, *a.l.*). Some, as Thiersch, accept the form as a legitimate conjve. with a shortened mood-vowel. Curtius (*op. cit.* 323) denies this, and shews that all similar formations can be removed by simple emendation. Here he approves Paech's ὁ τε *προθέησι* (instead of vulg. ὁ δέ τε *προθέησι*),<sup>1</sup> and his comparison of N 62 ff., ρ 518 f., for a relative clause with the conjve. introduced into a simile with the indic. So *Ench.* 304. Dr. Leaf dissents; the two passages quoted are not in point. But the distinction he draws between them and the line in K seems to be without a difference. He also argues that where we have both conjve. and indic. in a simile, the former comes first, and this is generally so. But we have two cases to keep K in countenance, and Am.-H. add P 522. There ὁ δὲ *προθορὰν ἐρίπησιν*, though it is a conjve. that precedes, is a good parallel to our phrase. There is yet another possibility, to read with Fick *προθέησι* from *προθέημι*. But there is sufficient authority for taking *ἐπείγετον* as indic. followed by a conj. So Stacke (*De comparationibus Hom.* 10).

*σφίσιν*, 398. If = *ὑμῖν*, unique in Homer. See Brugmann's *Ein Problem d. hom. Textkrit.* 42.<sup>2</sup> But he assumes K is an exceptional book, and seems (p. 43) to leave the solution of the question dependent on the view we take of its age. Dr. Leaf, *a.l.*, argues for the meaning *ὑμῖν* and for false archaism. Dr. Monro (*a.l.*, and *H.G.* 221) accepts a very different and a much

<sup>1</sup> Ar. read δὲ *προθέησι*. Ahrens had already (*Philologus*, vi. 25) suggested that the hiatus before δ had led to the insertion of the τε.

<sup>2</sup> The conclusions in this learned work

have not met with general acceptance. See Lehrs' review, in his *Kl. Schriften*, 101 ff., and cf. Lentz, *Iterat.* 19. See also Leaf, vol. i. App. A, and Monro thereon, *Odyssey*, p. 437.

more simple and natural interpretation of the passage, taking *σφίσιν* in its ordinary sense. It is a question of the reading of the line,—*βουλεύ-*, ἐθέλοντι against *βουλεύ-*, ἐθέλοιτε. Opinion is divided and is never likely to be at one. Out of 17 editions which I have consulted, 7 give the reading on which Dr. Leaf relies, and 10 the other.

I refer to the discussions of 309-12 = 396-9 and 208-10 = 409-11, pp. 225 f. *infra*, and suggest that what is there stated confirms the view of Dr. Monro, and that it is unnecessary to infer archaising. *σφίσιν* in 398 seems to have its ordinary meaning.

*ἐγρηγόρθασι*, 419. A false form (Leaf, *a.l.*) due to a misunderstanding of *ἐγρήγορθαι*, 67, which is from a perf. mid., and *ἐγρήγορθε*, H 371, Σ 299, which may be mid., or (*Ench.* 404) act. for *ἐγρηγόρατε*. Dr. Monro, on the contrary, thinks (*H.G.* 25 and *n.*) “a Perf. in -θα may be recognised in *ἐγρηγόρ-θασι* . . . perhaps in the Opt. *βεβρώθοις*, Δ 35.” Cf. Leaf on Θ 270. Paley, *a.l.*, says *ἐγρήγορθα* for *ἐγρηγόραθα* (like *ἐπενήνοθα*). But van Leeuwen (*Ench.* 404 *n.*) quotes authority for Dr. Leaf’s view. For the insertion of θ see *ibid.* 354, and Kühner-Blass, ii. 239, where is the sinister remark that *ἐγρήγορθα* occurs only in K. Brugmann (*Gr. Gram.* 348) seems to think the form may have come into existence in a natural way. See also Hinrichs, *Aeol.* 15 f. The form has yet to be explained. Archaising is only one possibility. The fact that the author of K knows and uses the mid. in 67, rather diminishes the ground for suspecting that he was using in 419 a word which he did not understand.

*κράτεσφι*, 156. See Leaf, *a.l.*, *Ench.* 237, Jebb, 137 *n.* and *H.G.* 91. It is a “quite anomalous” form, if a dat. sing., so far as our knowledge of the stem goes, but the *H.G.* (*l.c.* with note) shews that all is not quite clear to the philologists yet. There is a possibility that *κράτεσφι* may have been as correct as *στήθεσφι*. *ἐσχαρόφιν* is well vouched, though we know *ἐσχάρη* only. *κοτυληδονόφι* is also, so far as we know, irregular (*Neubildung*, Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.* 239). But is it certain that *κράτεσφι* is meant for a dat. sing.? Ebel, Seiler and Gehring, *s.v.*, and Brugmann, *l.c.*, take it to be a dat. pl., the last-named calling it a *Neubildung* like (according to some authorities) *πόδεσσι*. So King and Cookson, 332, comparing the -εσ- in *ἐπέεσσι*. -φι was originally a plural ending (*C.R.* viii. 402),

and if *κράτεσφι* is sing., it is the only case of a sing. in -*φι* of the 3rd decl. in Homer (Kühner-Blass, i. 491). But it is a question if the plur. is admissible in K 156. Can the poet in that line be referring, as in 152, to the heads of the whole company, and not to Diomedē's head alone? The interposition of 154 f., which certainly relate to Diomedē alone, followed by *τόν* in 157, seems to me to be against the idea. If the authorities quoted are right, then *κράτεσφι* can be explained as a corruption of *κρατί σφι*, which the minor scholia have preserved (Thiersch, *Gr. Gram.*<sup>3</sup> 293, and cf. Leaf, *a.l.*). *κρατί* and *τάπης* would both be in place as singulars, though referring to several heads. (Cf. *σαυρωτῆρος* in 153.) A shield of any kind is a poor pillow, be it for private or captain, without something softer folded between the head and the shield. See p. 197 *infra*. But I cannot myself think the poet was in 156 referring to the heads of Diomedē's company. Thiersch suggested that the original might have been *ὑπὸ κρατός φιν*, seeing in *φιν* "a vanishing trace of the old Dat. *ἴν* or *Fίν* instead of *οῖ*." If we could postulate a '*Fί* or *Fι*, a form that could everywhere replace *οι* in the poems, then KPATIFI, later KPATII, may have been the puzzle that led to the adoption of *κράτεσφι*, on the analogy of *Ἐρέβεσφι*, *δχεσφι*, *στήθεσφι*, *δρεσφι*, which occur 14 times in the position in the verse occupied by *κράτεσφι*. But the origin of the various forms of the pronoun is still debated (Solmsen, 199; Brugmann, *op. cit.* 246). There is nothing clear about *κράτεσφι*. It cannot be said beyond doubt that it is a false coinage. It may be a corruption. It may even be correct.

*σπεῖο*, 285. "Perhaps" a false archaism (Monro, *Introdn.* to K), on the mistaken analogy of *αιδεῖο* (Am.-H. *a.l.*; Christ, *Hom. od. Homdn.* 107; Menrad, 136, and others). But this seems to be no more than suspicion. Schulze's explanation (404 f.), adopted by Dr. Leaf (cf. his note, E 423, on the forms in -*σπ*), is much simpler,—that it is a case of lengthening in the first *arsis*. Lines commence with *ἐπεί* or *διά*; why not with *σπέο*? A scribe might lengthen the first syllable, whether with a recollection of *αιδεῖο* or without it. There is no need to assume archaising. Van Leeuwen (*Ench.* 371) amends to *ἔσπεό μ' ὡς*. "Athené," he somewhere says, "could not have listened to Diomedē, if he spoke broad Doric!"

*δρεσφι*, 185. Dr. Monro, *H.G.* 188, 151, thinks this is

"perhaps a false archaism," but on what appear to be slender grounds. Also that *τιθήμενον*, 34, may be the same. But I cannot find any grounds stated. See p. 259 *infra*.

*εῖασεν*, 299. The suggestion here is made in Dr. Leaf's note *a.l.* There is just a possibility, no doubt, that a late imitative poet, with inadequate grammatical knowledge, was misled by *ἡτίμασεν* or *ᾶασεν*, but surely it is just as likely to have been a copyist's error. As Dr. Leaf himself says, "P. Knight's *εῖαεν* is no doubt right." Cf. *εῖα Ἀθήνη*, σ 346, and note the impfts. *κικλήσκετο* and *ἡρτύνετο*, K 300, 302. Again, *εῖασ'* *Ἐκτωρ*, which is condemned as rhythmically impossible, is given by one MS., it was accepted by Wolf and Bekker, and it is printed by Monro, Am.-H., Christ and others. On such verse-endings, see Ludwich, *Ar.* ii. 330 ff., and Sommer in *Glotta*, i. 156 f.

These are all the cases. It is greatly to be regretted that more has not been written on pseudo-archaisms as a class by those who uphold them. We should then feel more certain as to their existence and significance. We have already referred to the caution administered by Monro and Jebb. Jebb follows Monro closely, but, judging from the paucity of the references to these archaisms in the *H.G.*, one cannot think such forms can be numerous. Father Browne (*Handbook*, 47) says they are, but his examples are not convincing. Paley was an extremist on the subject (*Post-epic or Imitative Words in Homer*, ii. 33, and pref. to his *Iliad*, vol. II. xxxiv. ff.). For a damaging criticism of his position see Professor Mahaffy in *Macm. Mag.* xxxix., especially pp. 322 f. Professor Sayce (*App.* to Mahaffy's *H.G.L.* 275 ff.) finds in these archaisms confirmation of the theory that the language of the poems is a mixed, highly artificial dialect, but that belief seems to be doubted more and more in the present day. See, e.g., Mr. Agar's preface, quoting Dr. Monro. Mr Agar himself, I should think, would not believe in pseudo-archaising by the poet or poets. See p. 110 f. of his work. Modernisation is at least as good an explanation. Early poets are not given to archaising at all (p. 198 *infra*). The literary art had not, in epic times, got the length of "conventional stylising" (Rothe in *Jb.* 1889, 367, approving Gemoll and against Wilamowitz).

If such forms are due to late imitative poets, many of whom

are supposed to have laboured at the poems, it seems strange that we do not find the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* full of such indications. When a writer has an inclination that way, he usually indulges it freely. Morris and Newman, for instance, did so in their translations of Homer. Tennyson loved an archaic word or phrase. His son tells us so, and that the poet used to regret that he had never been able to bring in the word "yarely." The authors of the Revised Version of the Bible used many archaisms, and often stumbled (Driver, *Jeremiah*, 371 ff.). Macpherson, of Ossian fame, is an example of the dangers of composing in a language one is not thoroughly familiar with. But generally those who have affected the archaic in language have been learned men in a literary age, and they have not made mistakes. But the late Homeric bards, with a leaning to the antique, and without the ability to cultivate the taste successfully, should have sown their work with false archaisms.

That they certainly have not done. Our own poet's mistakes number, at the outside, nine, though we do not know of any one scholar who includes more than six in his list. And observe the terms in which they are stated. They "seem to be" or "perhaps are" archaisms, or "we may admit the possibility." And when we examine the possibility, we find there is in every case some explanation as good as that of failure to achieve the archaic. And even if this were their origin, there would be no ground for arguing lateness. Archaisms might have been produced "in 800 or 900 as easily as in 450 B.C. by an Ionian poet who found in the traditional epic diction forms or phrases which no longer existed in the living idiom of his day" (Jebb, *l.c.*). That was surely possible enough if, as the learned hold, the epic art, with its language and verse, was the fruit of a long period of development. Christ observes (*Interpol.* 191; cf. Browne, 49, and Cauer, pref. to *Odyssey*, xi. f. on *ἀπηύρα*) that anomalies of the kind are found in the oldest parts of the poems. They would tend to indicate a difference of authorship, only if we could assume that the language of "Homer" was absolutely perfect. But it is surely just as reasonable to see in them the errors of copyists, or the "fond things vainly invented" (Agar) by them or by editors in later ages, or even the innocent slips of an early bard. Jebb illustrates his position in the matter from *ἔείσατο*, which Wackernagel took as a scribe's error for *έήσατο*. Both

would be written in early days EECATO. Our own case of *παραφθαλησι* is another illustration.

And lastly, we notice how inconsistent this part of the case is with another head of the indictment against the author of K. He is charged with being a late imitator who sought to reproduce the archaic language of the best days of the epic. His "archaistic tendency," Dr. Leaf says (vol. ii. 629), is "notable." But he is also discredited by long lists of words and expressions which are not to be found in the *Mēnis*, or in other comparatively early and unobjectionable strata of the *Iliad*. He could hardly have a serious desire to imitate his ancient models by affecting the antique, and at the same time so far neglect the traditional language, and especially its copious and distinctive commonplace, that numerous deviations from established epic usage can now be marked in his lay.

A still more serious allegation against him relating to archaeological tendency is discussed further on, pp. 197 f. *infra*.

## CHAPTER XII

### THE DIGAMMA

THE Digamma has been used by the critics as a test of the age of a given part of the poems. It died a natural death in the Ionic of Asia Minor about 800 b.c. (Thumb, *I.F.*, ix. 325 and 334; Fick, *Odyssey*, 8, and *Entstg. d. Od.* 7; and S. and A. *Introduction*, lxxii.). Before its death it gradually weakened through a period of decay (*Verwitterungsepoke*). Its experience was thus the reverse of that of the Article. The latter, but nascent in *Ur-Ilias* days, only reached its prime when, centuries later, the finishing touches were being put to the poems. The Digamma, on the other hand, was "a living sound when the poems began ; they lasted till it had become for Ionia a dead convention" (Leaf, vol. II. x.). Betweenwhiles it was gathering to itself the infirmities of age, and these infirmities are characteristic of the books and passages of the poems composed in the interval. This is a useful theory to Dissectors, and they apply it freely when they are bent on proving a passage late, and are neglecting no indication that can be turned to account. "There is a suspicious neglect of the Digamma in line—," or *interpolatorem prodit neglectum F verbi*—, is a common form of remark. See *Ench.* 143. The suggestion often is that the mere neglect is a sign of lateness, because such neglects are not found to mar the purity of the language of early lays. δ' οἴνοι, I 224, is an Ionism according to Robert. So then is δ' οἴκαδ', A 19. To be sure most of the neglects of *F* in *A* have been amended away. So they may be elsewhere by any one with a good knowledge of the poems and endowed with a little ingenuity. Difficulties are stated only to be solved by the *Zauberschlag*, *omittē* or *lege τὸ δεῖνα*. But,—though Mr. Agar, in the Preface to his *Homeric*, thinks the end is in sight,—all the neglects in *A* have not been

purged out of it. And so long as there remains, in the very earliest stratum of the *Iliad*, an irreducible residuum, neglects of *F* in other parts of the poems can have little importance. If the passages impugned get the same treatment as the *Ur-Ilias*, their Digamma-phenomena will prove as little against them as similar blemishes prove against the kernel of the *Iliad*. Nowhere is more use made of *F* to discredit passages than in Robert's *Studien*. But take away from his instances those in which *F* is disputable, those in which neglect of *F* would not be generally admitted, and those which can be paralleled in the *Ur-Ilias*, and little remains.

And we observe that there is a large body of the very highest authority in favour of the view that the Digamma-phenomena are uniform throughout the poems, and cannot be used as a test for predicating late and early in them. We have found the same for the epic language and verse generally (p. 48 *supra*). Not that these authorities are all agreed on what we may call the Digamma Question; far from it. The various theories can be found described in any manual. But only this, that many scholars of standing are agreed that neglects and observances of *F* are so uniform that it is impossible to use it as a test of age. The *Ench.* 147 (and cf. 567) puts this succinctly: *nam modo ab hoc, modo ab illo vocabulo Homericō digamma abest, neque in recentioribus tantum locis sed in antiquissima quaque Iliadis vel Odysseae parte hic illuc neglegitur.* Naber, who is conspicuous among the Dissectors, also rejects *F* as a test (*Q.H.* 79), and quotes authorities. I content myself with reference to Friedländer, *Zw. h. W.* 770; Ludwich, *Ar.* ii. 278; Bréal, *Journ. des Sav.* 1903, 143, *Rev. de Par.* 1903, 764, and *Pour mieux*, 221; Jebb, 142 n.; and Browne, *Handbook*, 80. Christ might also be claimed as, on the whole, an adherent of the same view, though the result of his discussions in his various works (*Interpol.* 144 ff. and 166 ff., *Hom. od. Homdn.* 27, 59, *Iliad*, 150 ff.) seems to be that in certain parts of the *Iliad* and in the *Odyssey* there is a difference observable. But even between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* he finds no difference worth remarking (*Interpol.* 167). Still there are, he says, small differences. Thus in his *H.G.L.* 43, he finds that the *F* of *οἵως* is more frequently neglected in the *Odyssey*. But he has omitted to notice that the word is used in that poem twice as often as in the *Iliad*.

But in spite of all these declarations by the experts, passages and books continue to be tried by the Digamma, and we propose to submit the Doloneia to the same test. Some, as Thumb and S. and A., *opp. citt.*, investigate on the vulgate. Others correct freely. But once admit corrections, other than such as are trifling and generally acceptable, and uncertainty comes flooding in. The cautious will not accept the amendments of the rash emendators, and they in turn sneer at conservative policy which "regards any change as *peius angui*."

Another difficulty is that philologists are not agreed as to the words which are digammated in the poems. Hartel's list is often followed, but there are authorities who will take exception to one item or another in it. Compare the lists in the *H.G.*, Thumb's paper, the *Ench.*, Christ's *Prolegg.*, Leskién's examination of Bekker's treatment of the Digamma, and other works. *'Ιλιος* and *'Ιλαος* are well-known examples. And there are differences as to whole classes of words, as those which originally commenced with *σF* (Thumb, 331). L. Meyer's proof, in *K.Z.* xxiii. 53 ff., that words commencing with *o*, *ou* or *ω* have not *F* in the poems, is generally accepted, but the rule is not always observed. Again, to take an individual word, Leo Meyer and Prellwitz accept *Ferώστιος*. But another authority holds that "nothing could be less justified" (*C.Q.* iii. 273). The Digamma, it is recognised, did not vanish from all words *eodem temporis vestigio*. There is still much uncertainty about individual words. Robert asserts initial *F* in a number of words to which other authorities would deny it.

There is disagreement on yet another question,—what are to be considered neglects of *F*? One class of cases is numerous and important,—those of a short syllable ending in a consonant *in thesi*<sup>1</sup> before initial *F* in the following word. Did *F* lengthen such a syllable? Solmsen says it did not. Hoffmann originated the idea (*Q.H.* ii. 50 ff.). Hartel developed it (*Hom. Stud.* iii. 76 ff.). van Leeuwen objected (*Ench.* 156 ff.) and gave strong reasons. Solmsen (129 ff.) upholds it and reinforces it by arguments from post-Homeric poetry in Doric, in which *F* had a longer life, and by analogous phenomena in Homeric verse. See also Meillet in *M.S.L.* 1909, 31. Writing in 1901, Solmsen

<sup>1</sup> I use the term, in what has become the current sense, of a syllable not bearing the *ictus*. But see Jebb, 192, and *C.R.* xix. 118.

regretted that the matter had received so little attention,—only from G. Meyer (*Gr. Gram.* 316 f.), and from Ludwich (*Ar.* ii. 283), who used it for his own purposes. See also Cauer, *Odyssey*, p. ix. n.<sup>1</sup> But Solmsen unfortunately overlooked the *Ench.* So the case is still with the judges, and till they decide it, we must remain uncertain how we are to regard a crux such as  $\mu\acute{e}laiav\acute{a}$   $\grave{\epsilon}\rho\acute{u}ssor\mu\acute{e}v$ , A 141, or  $\dot{\eta}$   $\acute{I}va$   $\dot{\nu}\beta\rho\acute{u}v$   $\dot{\iota}\delta\eta$ , A 203, or  $\kappa\acute{u}ntatov$   $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\acute{d}\acute{o}v$ , K 503. It is worth adding that, using this principle, Solmsen claims (p. 193) to have proved, in *Rhein. Mus.* liii. 146 f., that the Catalogue of the Ships, which many say is modern, observes *F* carefully.

Or consider another set of cases. It has been finally established by Thumb and Solmsen that *F* was a semi-vowel with the sound of the English *w* (ü). How then can  $\delta'$   $o\acute{u}ka\delta'$  or  $\delta'$   $o\acute{u}vo\acute{u}$  be considered a neglect? Bentley remarked that *dwoikad* is as easy to pronounce as *dwell*. The point is of interest for us, as we have, in K 497,  $\nu\acute{u}kt'$  *Oiv\acute{e}i\acute{d}\acute{a}o*.  $\tau F\acute{o}u$  could not have been more difficult to pronounce than  $\delta F\acute{e}os$  or  $\delta F\acute{h}v$ . The elision before a semi-vowel is not a great matter. In Latin the vowel of -*ne*, and even syllables ending in a consonant, could be elided before a full consonant, if the verse required it. All neglects of *F* are evidently not equally serious.

It seems then that any mere enumeration of what an individual scholar deems neglects, is not enough for the condemnation of a given area in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*. Every instance must be considered, and the net debit against the passage weighed against a similar result for what critics regard as a standard piece of pure *Ur-Ilias*. And that is what we propose to do for K. We shall find that it survives the comparison. And what then? The Dissector may tell us he is not surprised; the bards of the decadence or the superior rhapsodists often had “an accurate sense of the old epic language.” It has been said already. Christ (*Interpol.* 169) pauses to explain why some cantos,—K is one of them,—shew so little Digamma-irregularity. It is due to the “inclination of the individual poet.” This is one of those resources of destructive criticism which are intended to render opposition dumb. It seems to

<sup>1</sup> I have been able to trace one brief reference to the theory in English,—Mr. Allen's in *C.Q.* iii. 224. See now, for a thoroughgoing review of the whole

question, against Solmsen, Danielsson in *I.F.* xxv. 264 ff. Sommer in *Glotta*, i. 150, appears to accept Solmsen's views.

render Christ's own discussions on the Digamma futile. But there are Dissectors who will not regard or even require any such speculation. Bechtel, for example (*Vocalcontr.* 3), pronounces regarding K,—apparently on the simple ground of *διασκοπιάσθαι ἔκαστα*, which he assumes is borrowed from P 252, and of *δίειπε*, which Fick would replace by *δίεικε*,—that *F* had vanished from the speech of the poet.

Some other attempts have been made to use the Digamma to discredit the Doloneia, though we may observe that it seems very extraordinary that they have been so few. In nearly all the set attacks on the language of K, by Düntzer and Orszulik, by Monro and Leaf and Jebb, the Digamma is not so much as mentioned. We must assume there were no faults, or not faults enough to make a case. Yet those of the extremest view are prepared to accept as late a date as 650 b.c. for the Doloneia. This makes its author later than Hesiod, and contemporary with Archilochus. In the first 579 lines of the *Works and Days*,—an area as large as K,—there are some forty neglects of *F*. For Archilochus, Thumb (p. 329; cf. Fick, *Od.* 8, and Seymour, *L. and V.* 35) gives the ratio of observances to neglects as 0 : 13. The difference, in regard to *F*, between their language and that of the *Mēnis* written centuries before, is plain to everybody. *καὶ κ' ἀλαὸς διακρίνετεν*. And K also should be equally unlike the original *Iliad*. But it is not.

Hoffmann, in his *Q.H.*, cut up the *Iliad* into many pieces of different ages with the help of the Digamma, and (ii. 254 f.) posted K to an age *qua confectae sunt multae partes Iliidis, quibus inter se conjunguntur antiquiora . . . carmina*. His work is a monument of industry, but it has not had lasting value. See Friedländer, *Zw. h. W.* 770, 776; G. Curtius, *Andeutgn.* 32 f.; Ilg, *Hom. Kritik*, i. 19 f.; and Peppmüller, *Comment.* xv. The progress of both philology and Homeric criticism has been so great since his day, that it is certain that, if he were working now, he would, on the changed text, distribute the *Iliad* in different fashion. His final grouping is enough to condemn his results in the eyes of latter-day Dissectors. They will not accept an *Ur-Ilias* consisting of A, P, X, and part of Φ, or the inclusion in one category of Λ and K. The dictum of Wolf, often quoted with approval, and almost as often forgotten, that we should never be able to tell with accuracy the limits of

the lays which were massed to make an *Iliad*, has never been ignored more completely than by Hoffmann, *ex digammi indiciis servati aut neglecti Iliadem in minutulas particulas dissecente* (Christ, *Iliad*, 151). Hoffmann found in K bad neglects only in four passages, which he therefore held interpolations. It seems then that he should have adjudged the bulk of the Book to be ancient.

Of recent years K has figured in an interesting discussion by Thumb in pp. 329 ff. of his paper already referred to. He compares the Digamma-phenomena in certain parts of the *Iliad*, —the Achaean and Trojan Catalogues in B, the *Games* in Ψ 261-897, and the whole of K,—which the critics generally think they have proved *aliunde* to be late, with those in an early tract consisting of A and Λ, excluding the passages in these two books condemned by Christ. The vulgate is taken as a basis, without correction. Cases of *v* ἐφελκ. are left aside. Only initial Digamma is considered, and only in words in which its presence hardly admits of doubt. Words in which an original σF degenerated into the *spiritus asper* are excluded (as Thumb holds that F disappeared from them sooner than from others), and words commencing with o (not followed by i) or ω. In applying the Digamma as a criterion, hiatus-phenomena are, for reasons stated, mostly disregarded, and the Digamma effects taken into account are only (*positive*) cases in which, (1) a final long vowel or diphthong *in thesi* remains long before F, (2) those in which F makes “position,” and (*neglects*) (3) elision, (4) failure to make position, and (5) failure to prevent correction of a long vowel or diphthong. In short, Thumb seeks an adjudication on cases in which the active influence of F can be asserted with reasonable certainty.<sup>1</sup> The result is that he finds the proportions of the totals of observances and neglects are, for A and Λ, 12:9 = 1:·75, and for B, K, Ψ, 17:17 = 1:1. He also gives figures to shew that the latter agree with the oldest of the Hymns, and are therefore, I presume, of the same age.

The procedure seems open to question on several grounds. Many scholars will not accept Christ's excisions. The selection

<sup>1</sup> Professor Thumb has, with great courtesy to an entire stranger, explained to me that he does not deny all relevance to the words and phenomena which

he excludes, but that he finds them a less certain basis for inference. His method is essentially a tentative one.

of passages so much *sui generis* as the Catalogues in B will not seem a happy one. A more serious objection still is the smallness of the number of the instances on which a decision is reached. The element of chance must play a great part. There are parts of the poems where the frequent occurrence of a word or stock phrase which their subject requires, might vitiate the whole of the inference. Thus in P, counting on Thumb's method, I find a considerable preponderance of observances over neglects. But P is concerned, in great part, with the dragging hither and thither of the corpse of Patroclus, and no fewer than 8 out of the 23 observances of *F* are in the word *Fερύω*. And lastly, I have tested many books in the poems by the same method, and the results often do not by any means correspond to the views of advanced critics. For instance, N is generally decried as a mass of patchwork, much of it of late origin. Yet I do not find in the first 800 lines, or till we come to ἐπὶ δ' ἵλαχε λαὸς Ἀχαιῶν in 822 and 834, one single case that is a neglect of *F* within the meaning of Thumb's scheme, and *ἵλαχε* cases are themselves extremely doubtful (*Ench.* 164; *Meillet, op. cit.* 41; *Hartel, Hom. Stud.* iii. 37; and *Fick, Od.* 7 n.). Corroboration of the popular views of late and early is here wanting entirely. So it is, I find, in regard to Ω.

We might test K by Messrs. Sikes and Allen's plan (*op. cit.* lxiv. ff.), tabulating *all* Digamma-phenomena, though it means the inclusion of much that is unreal, the result of wear and tear. Taking K, 579 lines, A (excluding the *Chryseid*, supposed to be late), 551 lines, and ω, 548 lines, calculating observances and neglects in the way those authorities adopt, combining with their table on p. lxix., and reducing the proportions in a rough way to the same figure, 24, I find the proportions of observances to 24 neglects work out as follows:—ω, 73; A, 65; K, 62; *Ap. Pyth.* 56; *Aphr.* 45; *Ap. Del.* 38; *Cer.* 31; *Herm.* 12. It seems that A and K are practically in the same position in this matter, and that ω, which is supposed to be very late, is better than either.

A better plan perhaps is to examine every individual case of neglect. It is the neglects that are the really important factor. Taking K first, they are only 4 in number, for two apparent cases must be excluded from consideration as too doubtful, ηλυθ' *iωή*, 139, and δ' *iδρῶ*, 572. As to *iωή*, some

authorities give it *F*, but Curtius prefers *iωFή* from  $\sqrt{\alpha F}$ , and Thumb excludes the word from his list. But even if *Fiωή* were certain, we could read (*Ench.* 159)  $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\; Fiωή$ , for  $\eta\lambda\theta\theta\omegaν$  and  $\eta\lambda\theta\omegaν$  have been interchanged at times. And as to *iδρώς*, scholars are agreed that it had lost *F* before Homeric times (*Ench.* 174; *H.G.* 374; Prellwitz, s.v.; Fick, *Odyssey*, 7 f.; and Kühner-Blass' list). There remain four cases generally regarded as neglects. (1)  $\tau\dot{\eta}\nu\; νύκτ\acute{o}\; Oινείδαο$ , 497. This is a parallel case to  $\delta\; oīkaδ'$  in A. See p. 97 *supra*. And we find *Aιτώλιον*, *Oινόμαόν τε* and *δαιφρονος* *Oινείδαο* in lines 706 and 813 of E, in passages which some, as Christ, regard as of the old *Iliad*, not to mention *oū γάρ ἔπ' Oινῆος*, B 641, which is generally marked spurious. (2) *κύντατον* *ἔρδοι*, 503. Here we may read *κύντατα* (*H.G.* 368, and Bekker, *Hom. Blät.* ii. 23). If *ἀντία εἴπη* and *κρήγυνα είπας* are accepted in A 230 and 106, K cannot be denied the benefit of a similar change. There remain (3) and (4), two cases of neglect before *ἔκαστος*,—*πάντων οἱ ἔκαστος*, 215, and *διασκοπιᾶσθαι ἔκαστα*, 388. On the former Dr. Leaf remarks that “the omission of the *F* in *έκαστος* is very rare.” The omission seems to be common (*H.G.* 366, and *Ench.* 167). Dr. Monro observes that “the proportion (of neglects) that can be removed by emendation is not so large as in most cases.” A neglect of the kind in an old formula, *ὡς εἰπὼν ὥτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἔκάστου*, is amended by the critics, to *θυμόν τε ἔκάστου*, and so are cases occurring in what are considered the older parts of the poems. So they have been in our passages. In 215 Heyne replaced *οι* by *γε*; Brandreth, by *κε*. In 388 we can read *ἔκαστα διασκοπιᾶσθαι* with Christ, *a.l.*, and Menrad (120 *n.*), or *διοπτεύσοντα ἔκαστα* (see Fick, *Iliad*, 479). Or *ἄπαντα*; final *ἔκαστα* may have crept into some places. See, *e.g.*, critical notes on T 332, ρ 70, φ 222, and τ 463 (on which Agar, 349). But there seems to be no need to amend. It is quite certain that the *F* of *ἔκαστος* was very weak. There are at least 9 cases in the poems of the correction of *οι* and *αι* before the word, including *τῶν οἱ ἔκαστος*, θ 392, and *διασκοπιᾶσθαι ἔκαστον*, P 252.

If K is to suffer through *F*, it can only be on account of *Oινείδαο*, though we protest against even that case. For A, Christ (*Interpol.* 162) gives a list of 13 neglects of *F*. I omit *ὑπείξομαι*, 294, and *παρείπη*, 555, as I have not considered

$\delta\acute{e}i\pi\tau\epsilon$  in K;  $\delta\acute{s}$  κ'  $\epsilon\acute{i}\pi\tau\iota$ , 64, δ'  $\grave{\alpha}\acute{n}\acute{a}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu$ , 288, and γ'  $\epsilon\acute{i}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha i$ , 548, usually amended by the omission of the particle;  $\kappa\rho\acute{y}\gamma\mu\nu\eta\eta\eta$   $\epsilon\acute{i}\pi\tau\alpha s$ , 106, and  $\grave{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\acute{o}\nu$   $\epsilon\acute{i}\pi\tau\eta$ , 230, reading -a in each case; Ζεὺς δὲ πρὸς  $\grave{\delta}\nu$ , 609, not without hesitation; δ' οἴκαδ', 19, for which see p. 97 *supra*; and even  $\grave{\eta}\grave{\epsilon}$  καὶ ἔργω $\varphi$ , 395, though the approved correction,  $\grave{\eta}\acute{\epsilon}$  τι, may be questioned. But the remaining three are not so easy to deal with. For ἐσθλῆς ἔσσεται  $\grave{\eta}\grave{\delta}\grave{\o}\sigma$ , 576, Bentley suggested ἐσθλῆς ἔσται, and Nauck ἔσσεται ἐσθλῆς, which Christ characterises as *numeri pessimi*. They are at any rate not an improvement on the vulgate. Fick reads ἔσλας ἔσσετ'  $\grave{\nu}\grave{\grave{\alpha}}\grave{\delta}\grave{\o}\sigma$ . Boisacq, however, *s.v.*  $\grave{\eta}\grave{\delta}\grave{\o}\sigma$ , denies that it had *F*. And cf. *Ench.* 162. But the two that remain resist alteration. Attempts have been made on  $\grave{\nu}\grave{\beta}\rho\iota\acute{v}$   $\grave{\iota}\grave{\delta}\grave{\eta}$ , 203, but a satisfactory reading is not to be got *sine gravi mutatione* (*Ench.* 174). Robert and Bechtel omit the passage from their *Ur-Ilias*. As to μέλαιναν ἐρύσσομεν, 141, only one very poor emendation has been suggested. Robert and Bechtel (*Stud.* 214, 277) allow it to stand, referring to Usener. On Solmsen's principle, there is no neglect. But if that principle be applied universally, the utility of *F* to Dissectors is enormously reduced. A is no better than K in the matter of the Digamma.

I have similarly drawn out results for  $\omega$ , but it is unnecessary to extend them. Neglects can mostly be cured by very small amendments, and the doubtful residue does not seem to me as serious as that shewn above for A. I have also, in the course of my investigations, compared the results for many other books in the poems, and have found good ground for believing that those authorities are right who hold (p. 98 *supra*) that there is no difference, in the matter of *F*, between one area and another; and this, whether one takes with Thumb only the more decided effects, or with S. and A. all effects as exhibited by the vulgate, or, with the majority of critics, exercising the art of emendation and using the results of the most recent philology.

There seems to be no case against K on the Digamma. The evidence tends to place it in *Ur-Ilias* times.

## CHAPTER XIII

### THE VERSIFICATION

THE verse of K seems to be as perfect as that of any other lay. If its author was late, he must have had not only an accurate sense of the old epic language, including a wonderful knowledge of the lost Digamma; he must also have had a good ear, and must have been a master of the intricacies of the old epic verse. We may say no fault has been found with his versification. The caesura in 317 (*H.G.* 340) and the division of 453 (p. 69 *supra*) are hardly worth mentioning. In Christ's section on peculiarities of rhythm (*Interpol.* 170 ff.) K ranks with the best. But if its author's enemies cannot find faults, they can at least refuse him benefit from their absence. *Productiones duriores desunt* (Hoffmann, *Q.H.* ii. 220), but that is not to be counted to the poet for merit. *Casu accidit.* He was late, and the blemishes ought to be there. Good luck saved him.

But K is Odyssean, and the *Odyssey* differs from the *Iliad*, it is said, in points of verse structure. And on these points the Odyssean books of the *Iliad* are said to favour Odyssean ways. Not K, nor I, but Ψ and Ω. It is strange that the Odyssean group should be split into two parts, but so it is, according to the critics. We shall compare the poems as wholes, and also enquire how far the tainted books of the *Iliad* shew Odyssean leanings.

Commencing with "position," we may start from the following statement by Dr. Monro (*H.G.* 344, repeated, *Odyssey*, 333):—"Neglect of Position is perceptibly commoner in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*. Apart from cases in which the necessities of metre can be pleaded, viz. proper names and words beginning with υ -, it will be found that the proportion of examples is about 3 : 1. It will be seen, too, that some marked instances occur in Ψ and Ω." It is added that practice is still more lax in Hesiod and the

Hymns, and four bad cases are quoted from the “scanty fragments of the Cyclic poets.” This suggests steady degeneration from the early books of the *Iliad* through the Odyssean books and the *Odyssey* down to the Cyclics and the Hymns.

In K the only two cases that require to be noticed are ἀβροτάξομεν, 65, and δὲ πλέων, 252. Both are of course excused (LaRoche, *H.U.* 6) as words which could not be used if the consonants in the first syllable made position. As to πλέων, LaRoche (p. 15) accepts synizesis. But some object. See Solmsen, 136 *n.* In any case K compares well with any other part of the *Iliad*. In A, *e.g.*, we find two bad examples, ὅ γε πρίν, 97, and Ζεὺς δὲ πρός, 609. K’s character in this matter is easily vindicated.

Let us now extend the enquiry to Ψ and Ω, which contain “marked instances.” In each we exclude, as before, the cases of words the forms of which require that there be some relaxation of rule. There remain—as in A—just two cases without excuse in each book, in Ψ ἥξε πρός, 868, and ρόδόεντι δὲ χρῖεν ἐλαίφ, 186; in Ω ἔπειτα πρό, 783, and καὶ τά γε χρυσέην, 795, where LaRoche would excise γε. One case in each book is before a combination ( $\chi\rho$ ) before which a vowel remains short very rarely. (See, however, Agar, 129 ff. He would even restore in A 37, 451, ἀργυρότοξος, δ Χρύσην.) But all the four cases have this amount of palliation, that they occur in places in the verse,—after the first foot or in the Bucolic Diaeresis,—where there is a pause. There is thus no ground for any special imputation on Ψ and Ω. I has not even been charged. It will be seen further on that it has only one case, ὅθι πλεῦστα, 382. K has been cleared above. Therefore this particular metrical looseness cannot be used to separate the Odyssean quartette from the *Iliad*.

Nor can they be attached to the *Odyssey*, for I think it can be shewn that the practice in it is not noticeably different from that of the *Iliad*. Dr. Monro, as we have seen, says that cases are thrice as numerous in the *Odyssey*, but it is not clear how this result has been reached. It is a somewhat troublesome task to examine LaRoche’s lists (*H.U.* 1-41), and opinions will differ as to what is sufficient reason for removing words from the category of exceptions. To Monro’s “proper names and words beginning with υ –,” we must add words which have inside them

two consecutive syllables of the value of  $\cup -$ . And we must exclude standing formulae,—which, it may be noted, prove that neglect of position, when necessity compelled, was an old established practice. But how far is necessity to be recognised? When  $\cup -$  is within the word, there is no difficulty. But where  $\cup -$  is initial, there is often a doubt. Thus a short before such forms as *Κρονίων*, *Βροτῶν*, *θρόνοις*, *τρέμεις τρίτης*, must be allowed, or they are absolutely barred. But what of, say, *Κρόνος -ου -ω*, *τρέφει*, *τρίτη*, and the like? Any such word can be used if the poet arranges to have it followed by one commencing with a vowel. If then the poet does not so arrange, but uses the same licence in respect of these forms as in respect of those which it is quite impossible, without licence, to bring into the hexameter, are such cases to be counted against the versification or not? We submit they should not. The  $\cup -$  forms of such words may be taken as making a rule for  $\cup \asymp$  forms.

Discriminating then in this way, the only real exceptions appear to be *στάθμοί*, η 89, *δάκρυπλάσιν*, τ 122, *κέκρυμμένα*, ψ 110, *φαρέτρης*, Θ 323, *τύπτετε κληϊδεσσιν*, μ 215, ἄρᾳ *κλαιούσης*, ν 92, δθὶ *πλεῖστα*, δ 127, Ι 382, *αὐτὰρ ὁ πλησίον*, Δ 329, ἀμφὶ δὲ *χλαῖναν*, ξ 529, *μέλι χλωρόν*, κ 234, τὰ δὲ *δράγματα*, Λ 69, *ήγητοι Θρηκῶν*, Ε 462, *κατὰ κράτα*, θ 92, δέ τε *κρατί*, μ 99, *εἴλετο κρινάμενος*, Λ 697, δὲ *κράτος*, Τ 121, 7 cases in the *Iliad* of a final vowel kept short before *Πριαμίδης*, 2 before *πρίν* in the *Iliad* and 2 in the *Odyssey*, 4 before *πρό* in the *Iliad* and 1 in the *Odyssey*, *ὅν τινα πρῶτον*, γ 320, *ἥ σὺ πρῶτος*, ρ 275, 6 cases (other than in formulae) before *πρός* in the *Iliad* and 4 in the *Odyssey*, *οὐδέ τι προσφάσθαι*, ψ 106, *τινα Τρωιάδων*, Σ 122, δὲ *χρῖεν*, Ψ 186, and *τά γε χρυσείην*, Ω 795,—29 inexcusable cases from the *Iliad*, and 20 from the *Odyssey*. This is in favour of the *Odyssey*. We might, though I do not think we should, exclude the 9 cases before proper names in the *Iliad*, but, on the other hand, there are a few cases from the *Odyssey* which I have included in the list only after great hesitation. We may say the two poems are in this matter as nearly as possible in the same case. Of course another enumerator might bring out a different result, especially if small emendations, many of which LaRoche notices, are accepted. But the total number of cases for which nothing can be said must, on any counting, be so small that no sound inference can be drawn. Further, I believe that there is

explanation of, or at least some excuse for, the laxity in the great majority of cases, in the fact that it occurs at a pause in the verse. Thus, out of the ( $29 + 20 =$ ) 49 cases, the first 4 have the  $\text{---}$  within the word. Of the remaining 45 the great majority are situated in pauses, leaving only 10 or so for which there is no shadow of excuse.

It may be added that the list given by LaRoche (p. 42) of cases in which the rule is observed and violated in the same line, is very instructive. It contains lines from books of the *Ur-Ilias*, A, Λ, X. We may say then, as Dr. Monro says of hiatus, that it is unlikely that neglect of position was ever absolutely forbidden in epic verse. We think it equally unlikely that any difference in this respect between so-called early and late books will ever be established on LaRoche's lists. Any future examination of these will have to take account of the contents of Sommer's paper in *Glotta*, i. 145 ff. And perhaps, for comparison of books, a better method would be to take the ratio of neglects to observances.

It is also worth observing that, as briefly remarked in *H.G.* 344, the rule as to position is still more lax in Hesiod and the Hymns. For the former, instances are collected in Paulson's *Stud. Hes.* i., and for the latter in Eberhard's *Metr. Beobachtgn. z. d. hom. Hymnen*, i. For Hesiod I count some 17 inexcusable cases in say 2700 lines; for the four longer Hymns about 18 in 1900. There are in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, on my counting, about 49 in 28,000. Instances are from four to five times as numerous in Hesiod and the Hymns. And exceptions are allowed in these before combinations which always lengthen a preceding vowel in the two epics. The criterion, therefore, separates the latter from the later compositions, and the agreement of K with the rest of the *Iliad* and with the *Odyssey* is one more argument against the very late date to which some would assign it.

Next as to hiatus, on which much has been written in many treatises. It does not appear to have been asserted anywhere that the verse of K shews any special leaning towards this metrical irregularity, so there is no express charge to be rebutted. But Dr. Monro (*H.G.* 357) observes that "hiatus in the Bucolic Diaeresis is commoner in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad* in the proportion of 2 : 1. Hiatus after the vowel *e* is also comparatively rare in the *Iliad*; Knös"—the reference is to his *De Digammo*

*Homerico*, 41 ff.—“reckons 22 instances (many of them doubtful), against 40 in the *Odyssey*. It is worth notice that in both these points Ψ and Ω agree with the *Odyssey*.” We wish to contest this alleged difference between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and to defend the “Odyssean” books of the former.

First, we would remark that the statement seems to be wanting in precision, as statements regarding hiatus unfortunately often are. There is hiatus after a short, there is hiatus (“weak” or “improper”) after a long vowel. Authorities sometimes discuss “hiatus,” meaning only one or the other, but not stating which. There is also, to some metrical experts, as Knös, hiatus which is licit and hiatus which is illicit. And Knös, in the pages on which Dr. Monro draws, confined himself, for his own purposes, to hiatus after a short vowel (*Miss Stawell, H. and Il. 317*). When then Dr. Monro refers to hiatus in the Bucolic Diaeresis, the word is used in the restricted sense of licit hiatus, all hiatus there being, according to Knös and others, licit, and in the still more restricted sense of hiatus after a short vowel. But in regard to hiatus after ε, it is clear from Dr. Monro’s figures that he has collected instances from all Knös’ lists, and that he includes both licit and illicit hiatus. Nothing of all this appears on the face of his statement, which has been copied, in whole or in part, into a number of treatises without any explanation. See Jebb, 139 n.; Vogrinz, 47; and Browne, *Handbook*, 95.

On the merits, reference may be made to Miss Stawell’s discussion, *l.c.* She has rightly objected to the exclusion of cases in the Bucolic Diaeresis after long vowels, and shewn how small the difference between the two poems is when cases after long vowels as well as short are considered. Dr. Monro gives no reason for his discrimination (if intended) between the two classes. Another point noted by Miss Stawell is the effect of the greater amount of speech in the *Odyssey*. But there is more to be said. A very cursory examination discloses defects in Knös’ enumeration for the Bucolic Diaeresis. It is not complete. I note the absence of E 221, Z 422, K 93, and E 560 (where ἔουκότες may have been read). There seems to be a case in A itself. θάλασσά τε ἡχήσσα, 157, cannot perhaps be claimed, but in line 129 and in 5 other places in the *Iliad* the authorities would restore εὐτείχεα (*vulg. εὐτείχεον*). And Knös omits cases of elision, no doubt as unnecessary for his enquiry. But the omission is questionable for Dr.

Monro's purpose (and see p. 112 *infra*). There are many cases in the poems like  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\tau\rho\pi\acute{\epsilon}$  ἀθανάτοισιν and ἄχε' ἄκριτα θυμῷ. Again, are we to take an old-fashioned or an up-to-date text? Knös excludes the type ἔγχει ὁξύοεντι (for which Agar, 330, suggests *Foξ-* or *φοξ-*). But read ἔγχεῖ with most editors, and you have hiatus after a short. If you replace -*ov* by -*oo*, you manufacture cases by the score. And then the Digamma. If you reject *Fίλιος*, *Fός*, *Fέλκος*, *Fέρκος*, *Fέθνος*, etc., the list will be greatly enlarged. And *jod.* Some are positive that it never existed in the epic language (*Ench.* 181). *εἵσατο* alone, excluded by Knös, would add 4 cases. And so on. Much progress has been made since Knös wrote in 1872-3. He would draw up a different list now. But his list would not please everybody. And to sustain an indictment such as the *H.G.* bases on it, very great care would have to be devoted to it.

Again, much value cannot be attached to a difference based on such small totals for 28,000 lines as 23 and 38. And if the suggestion is, as it appears to be, that there was degeneration in the matter of hiatus after a short between the periods of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, then surely we should not confine ourselves to the Bucolic Diaeresis. If we test for degeneration in other positions, we find the inference greatly weakened. The cases of hiatus after the third trochee are (Knös, p. 42 ff.) *Iliad* 55, *Odyssey* 49. There is not much difference here, even after allowing for the smaller number of lines in the *Odyssey*. The cases after the first dactyl are 10 (perhaps considerably more) in the *Iliad*, 3 in the *Odyssey* (p. 47). This is in favour of the *Odyssey*. And as to illicit hiatus (pp. 47 f.), the two poems are as nearly as possible alike.

Next as to hiatus after ε. What is there in this ε? Dr. Monro does not explain. There are 7 cases after ι in the *Iliad*, and 2 in the *Odyssey*. Are we to discriminate between the two vowels? That hiatus after ι is licit makes no difference. Whatever we argue on ε against the *Odyssey* can be argued against the *Iliad* on ι. And of the ε cases in the *Iliad*, 5 are in Ω, 2 in Ψ, while in Ι and Κ there are none. Again the four books do not hang together. And Miss Stawell seems to have reason when she says that the doubtful cases are in the list from the *Odyssey*, rather than, as Dr. Monro says, in that from the *Iliad*. For example, in a 225 we should probably

read  $\tau\acute{\imath}s \delta\acute{a}l \tilde{\sigma}\mu\tilde{\iota}\lambda\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$ ; γ 160 is  $o\tilde{\iota}k\alpha\tilde{d}\epsilon F\acute{e}\mu\tilde{e}\nu\tilde{o}\tilde{i}$ . In 3 cases of  $\eta\delta\acute{e} \tilde{\chi}\phi\alpha\tilde{s}\kappa\tilde{o}\tilde{n}$  -ε, a μ' or a F' should be inserted. And there are a number of cases in which philologists would give effect to a lost initial σ, now represented by the rough breathing in  $\tilde{\nu}\pi\nu\tilde{o}\tilde{s}$ ,  $\tilde{\nu}\pi\acute{o}$ ,  $\tilde{\delta}\mu\tilde{\omega}\tilde{s}$ , etc. See Mr. Allen in *C.Q.* iii. 226. And other considerations might be urged. If cases after elision are to be included, there are at least 3 in A,—2, 96, and 445. A more careful enumeration will be required. Lists drawn up for quite another purpose are dangerous to argue on. I note that Miss Stawell seems to omit 6 of Knös' cases from her list for the *Iliad*, apparently on account of F. But all scholars would not agree.

If attempts are to be made to dissociate a book or books from the rest by the hiatus criterion, then it is submitted that *all* hiatus phenomena should be counted, on some plan such as that adopted by Professor Clapp in his edition of T-Ω, App. 430 ff. I have made a rough count for K and the "Continuation" of the *Odyssey*, as late, and for A and Λ, as early books, taking 579 lines (the length of K) in every case. I find they give very similar results. Between them and *Hym. Merc.*, however, I find a great gulf fixed. But Professor Clapp's classification of cases seems to be open to criticism on a number of points. And it seems unlikely that there will ever be results of any value from the hiatus test, till there is greater consensus among experts. They have much to settle still about lost initial consonants. Oscar Meyer's *Q.H.* may be referred to. And some of the principles on which they proceed at present seem questionable. Take the case of elision. Professor Clapp says, "where one vowel has already been elided from the first word, the two words are so closely bound together that the hiatus is not felt." I suppose it is heresy to question this, but one would think *prima facie* that the closer the two words are, and the nearer the final vowel of the one is brought to the initial vowel of the other, the *more* the hiatus must be felt, till artificial means, by contraction or synizesis, are resorted to to remove it. The nearer they are without being amalgamated, the shorter the pause between them, and the greater the difficulty or the unpleasantness of pronouncing them separately. If the least objectionable form of hiatus is that which is present when the vowels are separated by a distinct pause, when, as Knös

puts it (p. 45), there is *silentio interposito nihil detrimenti a sequentibus vocalibus*, then one might suggest that the worst form is that produced by elision. And the text will have to be better ascertained, and quarrels over the principles of textual criticism will have to be composed, before much dependence can be placed on hiatus statistics. One never knows how far the vulgate is being worked on, and how far amendments are accepted. It seems impossible to reconcile the figures given by Knös, by Hoffmann (*Q.H.* i. 88 ff.), by van Leeuwen (*Ench.* 79 f. and 592), and by Seymour (*L. and V.* 40 f.).

Professor Clapp says (p. 430), "Homer is said to avoid hiatus, and yet in more than 2000 places in the 3754 verses of T-Ω, according to our text, a word ending with a vowel is followed, in the same verse, by a word beginning with a vowel." And if the critics are right in their belief that the text has been altered freely to remove hiatus, it must have been much more common originally than now appears. Even omitting cases that are classed as only "apparent," it may be said that hiatus occurs almost once in every two lines of the poems. So hiatus was not avoided, but only very bad forms of it, of which there are few, so few that their distribution affords no basis for dissection. Again, hiatus inside a word is surely worse than between two words. When we find such collocations of hiatus in the interiors of words as those in *ἡϊε* and *όίεατ*,—both in A,—it is not easy to believe that the author or authors of the poems considered themselves bound to be at great pains to avoid it between words. Why should *ἀγλά' ἄποινα* be objectionable if *ἀγλαά* is to be passed as blameless? In *ἐπὶ οὐρα* there is hiatus; join them into a compound and there is none. So with *τί ή* and *τίη*. The critics with one breath object to hiatus between words, and with another restore such cacophonies as *'Αργεῖοισι*, *ἐνεργής*, *κακομηχάνοο*, *προσεφώνεε*, *δέεεος*. Dr. Monro's conclusion (*H.G.* 357) is that hiatus was never absolutely forbidden in epic verse. That is surely not strong enough. Better with Kühner-Blass, i. 191, to say that the Homeric language avoided hiatus, *doch nicht sehr ängstlich*. Wecklein (*Textkrit.* 70) thinks hiatus was not objectionable to the Ionian ear, that it was at one time much more frequent in the poems than it is in our text, and that its removal in many cases was due to Attic influence. "The Greek ear was sensitive to hiatus"

(Allen in *C.Q.* iii. 225). The classical Greek ear was. Can that be said of the old Achaean ear? Do we know enough of the original language of the poems to warrant us in deciding? See Fick, *Entstg. d. Od.* 4. Such a line as  $\beta\lambda\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\,\dot{\eta}\,\dot{i}\hat{\omega}\,\dot{\eta}\,\check{\epsilon}\gamma\chi\epsilon\ddot{\iota}\,\delta\xi\nu\delta\epsilon\nu\tau\iota$  enjoins caution. But, be all this as it may, we think we have said enough to vindicate the *Odyssey* and the Odyssean books against the metrical head of charge,—so far as it has been formulated. The fact appears to be that the laws of the Homeric hexameter are still far from being thoroughly understood. A comprehensive treatise embodying the copious results of recent philology is a great want. The metric is bound up with the Digamma. Textual criticism to a great extent seems to wait on both. At present much is in a state of flux.

## CHAPTER XIV

### THE PARALLEL PASSAGES

It has been discovered by the critics that lines in a number of passages in K have been borrowed or imitated from the *Odyssey*. Their conclusion is that K is later than that poem. I refer chiefly to Gemoll in *Herm.* xv. 557 ff. See also Sittl, *Wiederhlg.* 30 ff.; Nitsche, 23 f.; Orszulik, 39 ff.; van Herwerden, *Q.H.* 130; Kammer, *Ästh. Komm.* 222; Ranke, 76 ff.; Franke, *Nom. propr.* 51 f. n.; Robert, 501 and n.; and W. Witte, *Stud. z. Hom.* 7. For Christ's views see pp. 120 ff. *infra*.

The Homeric Repetitions are admittedly a matter of the first importance. The literature of the subject is not scanty,<sup>1</sup> but unfortunately it is nearly all from the hands of Dissectors, who start with preconceived notions of late and early, and that spoils all. I shall endeavour to give, for every case of repetition in K, most of the principal opinions on it. I think the mere enumeration of contradictory pronouncements will often prove the futility of the method adopted.

I take Gemoll's essay as the basis of my examination. It has secured some approval from other critics, as Hinrichs (*Herm.* xvii. 105) and Cauer (*Grdfrgn.* 524). Niese (*Entwick.* 65 n.) gives modified adhesion, and so Wilamowitz (*H.U.* 231 and n., cf. 15). On the other hand Sittl (*op. cit.* 33 f. and 6) condemns Gemoll for his ignorance of repetition literature and for his "fixed idea" of the *centoartiger Charakter* of K, and compares him with Peppmüller on Ω, "a deterrent example."

Rothe has also some very unfavourable comments in *Jb.*

<sup>1</sup> I have had reluctantly to reserve for a future occasion a chapter reviewing the contents of these treatises and the principles on which they proceed. They are nearly all German. Rothe's

*Wiederholungen* is in a category by itself. It opposes the popular view. Hennings has some remarks on it in *Homers Odyssee*, 37 ff.

*Bursian*, 1883, 323. Seeck (*Quellen d. Od.* 287) remarks "how fallacious the method is." Three years later Gemoll returned to the subject unmoved by Sittl's rebuke (*Herm.* xviii. 308 ff.). In the same volume, 34 ff., he applies his method to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as wholes. It has already been stated (p. 15 *supra*) that, by the same method, Düntzer has proved that it is the *Odyssey* that imitates, and consequently is *later* than K.

Gemoll finds that there are pairs of passages in K and the *Odyssey* with the same phrasing and construction, and containing the same thought or describing the same situation. Only two explanations of any such coincidence are possible. Either the matter is of the nature of a standing formula, or it is the product "of one poetic individuality," from which another has copied it. If the former alternative is excluded, the latter must be accepted, and we must enquire as to proprietary right. That is, plagiarism is assumed! It is hasty procedure, for it ignores what other scholars of the highest authority regard as one of the most patent characteristics of the poems, as it is of many early literatures and even of some poets in a literary age,—the free repetition of matter. Yet it is a favourite means of discrediting a passage. Any one who is familiar with Dissecting literature knows how frequently lines which occur elsewhere are condemned, without any serious attempt being made to establish priority. How much can be proved by manipulation of Repetitions is shewn by Mülder, *Quellen*, 322 f., and by many other authorities.

Gemoll's cases are:—

1. K 26-8 and δ 145 f. The phrase *πόλεμον θρασύν όρμαίνοντες*, which occurs in each, does not recur, and is not epic "small change." That is so far correct. But *πόλεμον θρασύν* is found, Z 254, and *όρμαίνω* with *όδόν*, *πλόον*, *φόνον*, in the *Odyssey*. References to the sufferings before Troy, similar to those in the passages we are discussing, are frequent (p. 173 *infra*). But Gemoll does not decide between K and δ. Düntzer (p. 476) pronounces δ the borrower.

2. K 97-9 and μ 281 f. Again Gemoll refrains from assigning priority. The similarity is confined to the phrase *καμάτῳ ἀδηκότες ἥδε καὶ ὑπνῷ*.

3. K 157-9, Nestor wakens Diomede, and, o 44-7, Telemachus wakens Pisistratus, in each case *λὰξ ποδὶ κινήσας*. There has been a dispute since the days of Aristarchus (Am.-H. *Anh.* to o

45). Some favour K, because Nestor was old, and of course an old man cannot stoop. But Gemoll asks why "in all the world" the line (45), if unsuitable, was inserted in *o*. Why indeed? But he does not decide in which place it is original. In his later paper, however, he favours *o*, because the *ὕπνον ἀωτεῖν* of K recurs only κ 548. But how "in all the world" does that affect the question? He also asks why Nestor could not waken Diomede with his spear. But a spear was sharp at both ends, *σαυρωτήρ* as well as *αιχμή*, and not very suitable for so delicate an operation. Blass observes (*Interpol.* 159) that the scene is full of humour, "which all do not understand."

He thinks (*l.c.* and 166) *o* 45 is spurious. See also Am.-H. *l.c.*, and Cauer (*Anmkgn.*, *a.l.*). Sittl (p. 31) and Monro (on K 158) are cautious. Wilamowitz (*H.U.* 15 *n.*), Christ (*Hom. od. Homdn.* 57), and Rothe (*Wiederhgn.* 129) favour K. Dr. Leaf (on K 158) thinks *λάξ ποδὶ κινήσας* is "less suitably used" in *o*. So K is vindicated.—If we consider the phrases in Z 65, E 620, Π 863, N 618, and Π 503, we may say our expression is not far from epic commonplace. To raise on it a question of plagiarism seems excess of zeal.

4. K 214 f. and *a* 245 ff.= $\pi$  122 f.= $\tau$  130 ff.,—containing the words *ὅσσοι γὰρ νῆσσοιν (νήσοισιν) ἐπικρατέουσιν ἄριστοι*. Gemoll does not object to that line being considered as suitable in K as in other places. Sittl (p. 31), Christ (*op. cit.* 57) and van Herwerden (*Q.H.* 13) prefer the *Odyssey*. Dünzter (p. 473) prefers K. There is nothing on which to decide.—*ἐπικρατέουσι* recurs, always in the same position in the verse, in Ξ 98 (dat. pl. of ptc.),  $\xi$  60 and  $\rho$  320 (-έωσι).

5. K 242-4 and *a* 64-7, two very similar passages. The critics give their attention to *ἔπειτα* chiefly. Sittl elucidates from the Rig-Veda. Fäsi thought it more suitable in K. Gemoll doubts; the lines there are unnatural and forced. In his later paper he makes up his mind for *a*. Niese and Lentz had ruled out *ἔπειτα* there. Gemoll objects, and agrees with Sittl (p. 32) that the *ἔγώ* is better in *a*.

In ancient times it was held that Zeus would not call a mortal *θεῖος*, but that is not now pressed. But see *C.R.* xvii. 238, where the passage in K is condemned. *θεῖος Ὀδυσσεύς* certainly seems to be of the *Gemeingut*. Even *πῶς ἀν* *ἔπειτα* recurs I 437 (cf. 444). But *ἔπειτα* remains the chief crux.

Some rely also on ἐγώ and λαθοίμην. I will only say briefly that Nitzsch, Düntzer, Wilamowitz, Christ and Rothe favour K, and Sittl, Blass, Wecklein and van Herwerden prefer the claims of *a*. Cauer (*Grdfrgn.* 486) finds the ἔπειτα in K suitable, the ἐγώ striking, the ἔπειτα in *a* wonderful, and the ἐγώ quite natural. What is to be thought of it all? The discussion has been quite infructuous so far. Hennings (*Odyssee*, 49 f.) frankly gives the puzzle up.

6. K 278-81 and *v* 299-301. These passages contain the sentence ή τέ μοι (*σοι*) αἰὲλ ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοισι παρίστασαι (-μαι). For Gemoll the words νῦν αὐτε μάλιστά με φῦλαι, Ἀθήνη, in K, settle the question of precedence. They occur in E 117. Therefore the passage in K is a cento! This provokes the scorn of Sittl (p. 33). Reichert (*De lib. Od. v et π*, 11) seems to say that *v* is the borrower. Much depends on which passage you wish to discredit. I would only add that, if we compare E 115-8 with our passages, the ἀπορία will be for some critic to decide order of origin for the three.

7. K 290-4. 290 is *v* 391. 291 reminds Gemoll of E 809. 292-4 = γ 382-4. So here we have another cento. Blass (p. 149) agrees as to K 290. Dr. Leaf thinks 292-4 probably belong to γ, but gives no reasons. Sittl (p. 34) would excise them; Düntzer (p. 473) would not. *v* 391 is rejected by van Herwerden (*Herm.* xvi. 374) and Agar (p. 240). And so on. See Am.-H. *Anh.* to both passages. As to K 291 and E 809, the similarity is in the use of παρίστασθαι καὶ φυλάσσειν. But see K 279, Ψ 783, δ 827, ο 35, *v* 47, γ 222, and p. 173 *infra*. δός is of course frequent. For φῦλαι cf. E 61. As to the lines 292-4, Sittl rejects them in K because they disturb the symmetry of the two heroes' prayers. Almost any reason will do. Düntzer, on the other hand, observes that in γ there is no special prayer requiring a vow to secure its fulfilment. There is something in this, if regard be had to the *do ut des* of Homeric supplications. Diomede, *more heroico*, thought special inducement necessary. See such cases as those in Δ 119 ff. and Z 305 ff. But, necessary or not, the vow in γ was fulfilled next morning. So we come to a halt again, till some fresh clue is found.

We may add one remark. If the poet of K was a cento-maker, why should he trouble to alter the πότνα and ἐπαρήγω

of  $\nu$ ? We might ask the same question about K 577 supposed to be taken from  $\zeta$  96. Why alter  $\chiρισαμένω$ ? Why alter the familiar  $\delta\psi\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \delta\eta\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\epsilon\pi\epsilon$  of H 399, etc., to  $\tau\omega\iota\sigma\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\epsilon\pi\epsilon$  in K 219? The poet could not think to conceal his theft. He did not need to conceal it; there was nothing to blush for. In epic days there was absolute freedom to appropriate. It seems strange.

8. K 324 and  $\lambda$  344. In K  $\omega\delta'$   $\alpha\pi\delta$   $\delta\omega\xi\eta\varsigma$  is peculiar; as an adverbial addition to  $\ddot{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\varsigma$  it is unsuitable. So there must be imitation,—by K, as the lines are clumsy in it, and its author habitually traffics in borrowed verses. But  $\alpha\pi\delta$   $\delta\omega\xi\eta\varsigma$  has no connection with  $\ddot{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\varsigma$ , and is not difficult to interpret (Sittl, p. 34, and M. and R. on  $\lambda$  344). And certainly there is no imitation. The whole frame of the sentence differs.  $\ddot{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\varsigma$  is only in the one.  $\sigma\kappa\omega\pi\varsigma$  has different meanings. Perhaps the same may be said of  $\alpha\pi\delta$   $\delta\omega\xi\eta\varsigma$ . See Mr. Lawson, *a.l.* It seems mere chance has brought  $\sigma\kappa\omega\pi\varsigma$ , in different senses, close to  $\alpha\pi\delta$   $\delta\omega\xi\eta\varsigma$  twice, and has given the “word-catcher” an opportunity.

9. K 351-3 and  $\theta$  124. These embody, Gemoll thinks, an epic formula, but he notes that  $\pi\rho\phi\varphi\epsilon\acute{e}st\pi\epsilon\pi\varsigma$  occurs, outside  $\theta$ , only  $\phi$  134,—a dark hint from which we are to argue the worst. There is no ground for suspicion. We might with equal reason suspect O 358 or  $\Phi$  251 (cf.  $\Psi$  529), because each contains a similar formula. See p. 175 *infra*. The remark on  $\pi\rho\phi$ . seems trivial.

10. K 454-7 and  $\chi$  326-9. The perverted use of  $\chi\epsilon\pi\varsigma$   $\pi\alpha\chi\epsilon\iota\eta$  in K is enough. Gemoll finds it comic of a suppliant. Düntzer (p. 470) decides for K, as  $\phi\theta\epsilon\gamma\gamma\omega\mu\acute{e}nou$  is more in place there. Christ also thinks (*op. cit.* 57 *n.*) that  $\chi$  is the imitator. To Sittl (p. 36 *n.*; cf. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* 231 *n.*) the argument from  $\chi\epsilon\pi\varsigma$   $\pi\alpha\chi$ ,—which occurs 18 times, always final in the verse, once of the hand of Penelopé,—is absurd. Epithets are often used without complete regard to suitability. Sittl also discusses  $\phi\theta\epsilon\gamma\gamma\omega\mu\acute{e}nou$ , but does not assign priority. Kammer (*Ästh. Komm.* 222) favours K.  $\alpha\bar{u}\chi\acute{e}na\ \mu\acute{e}st\pi\pi\varsigma\ \xi\lambda\alpha\sigma\pi\pi\epsilon$  is of course, like  $\chi\epsilon\pi\varsigma$   $\pi\alpha\chi$ , of the *Gemeingut*. Imitation in K has not been proved.

11. K 482-4 and  $\chi$  307-9. The authorities take different views, but it is not necessary to give particulars. There are four

occurrences in the poems, not these two alone. The line containing ἐπιστροφάδην is a formula. στόνος is found in exactly the same connection elsewhere, as Δ 445, T 214. Descriptions of the earth red with gore are frequent (p. 174 *infra*).

12. K 533-5 and 540. 533 recurs B 79; 534, δ 140. The remaining two remind Gemoll of π 5 f. (cf. also τ 444) and 11. So the passage is made up of reminiscences.

It contains formulae and expressions common in the poems. 533 recurs not in B only, but *eight* times. For the form of expression common to the lines in which κτύπος occurs, see B 41, Λ 466, ζ 122 and K 139. As to 534 and 540, how any one can say they are from the *Odyssey* and not *vice versa*, is hard to understand. Düntzer is sure δ 140 is borrowed from K 534. As to K 540 and π 11, cf. π 351 and also T 242.

This completes Gemoll's review. In some of the cases, he concludes, the proprietary right of the *Odyssey* is established *auf's bestimmteste*, while in others the opposite conclusion is negatived. Therefore the case is proved against K. This can, he thinks, surprise no one who knows the singular position of the Doloneia,—but this is *parti pris*—, and who makes it clear to himself that, if there *are* borrowings,—but there's the rub!—it is more probable that the great scenes of the *Odyssey* were before the author of K than *vice versa*. And borrowing from so many books is proved, that Gemoll concludes that the *Odyssey* had reached its present form before K was written. As Bougot says (p. 302) of Wilamowitz' Briseïs theory, it is *un bien petit argument en faveur d'une théorie bien hasardée*. A scrutiny of Gemoll's instances shews that in most of them there is nothing that can be taken as a criterion, so that the adjudication is on subjective grounds and the critics are divided, and that the similarity is generally due to the free use of epic commonplace. For a similar failure of the same method see Dr. Monro's review (*Odyssey*, 312, n. 30) of Sittl's attack on the *Telemachy*. The method is, in fact, as Rothe and others have proved over and over again, quite barren of satisfying results, wherever it is applied. See Rothe's *Wiederhlgn.* 147, and Lange, *Jb.* 1880, 142, reviewing Nitsche and Kuhlbars. Christ, in his work on the *Wiederholungen*,<sup>1</sup> adds a few cases.

<sup>1</sup> It and other treatises from Christ's pen had reference to his edition of the *Iliad*, and deal mainly with that poem. But no partial examination of parallel

passages can be of value. *All* in the poems that have a likeness must be brought under review.

K 1-4 (pp. 236 f.; cf. *Hom. od. Homdn.* 104, and Erhardt, *Entstg.* 157) are said to be an imitation of B 1-2. In B the lines are excellent; in K the statement that the rest of the chiefs (? “other chiefs,” *ἄλλοι*) were asleep contradicts lines 25 f. and 96, which say that Menelaus and Nestor were awake. “This is not mere disguised imitation, but a senseless repetition.” This seems to be an instance of the “dull rationalism” on which Wilamowitz pours scorn (*H.U.* 126). But if it is necessary to reply to it, we might, without going back to the *Poetics*, point out that we have no evidence that Nestor had not been asleep. Agamemnon found him awake, and may have thought he had not been asleep, but he *knew* nothing. As to Menelaus, Agamemnon says, 124, that he woke before himself. Therefore, we argue, he *must* have been asleep! So Christ’s objection vanishes. But is no licence, not even a little looseness of expression, to be allowed to the poet? Must, for instance, *ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες* in A 22,—much stronger than K 1,—mean that Agamemnon had not one sympathiser in the whole camp?

But Christ had forgotten that the opening of B has been assailed on just such a ground as he takes in regard to K. For this controversy—*de minimis*—started by Lachmann, taken up by Köchly and continued by others, see Am.-H. *Anh.* to A 611, and Bonitz, *Ursprung*, 74 ff. The point is hardly worth dwelling on. Jäger (*Hom. Aph.* 178) thinks Bonitz’ pages among the “most superfluous” ever written. See also Mülder, *Quellen*, 106.

And again, why deal with B and K only. Look at a third similar passage, Ω 677-81. The requisite modicum of absurdity is to hand. Why should Hermes ponder? He had already put the guards to sleep and could do it again. We must assume he had allowed sleep to release them. If he had, then that is in contradiction of lines 677 f. Then go on to ο 4-8. The passage has the family likeness, and there is inconsistency in it as glaring as ever. We are first told that Telemachus and Pisistratus were sleeping, and immediately afterwards not only that Telemachus was not asleep, but that anxiety kept him awake. So we have four similar passages, and all afflicted with the same infirmity. The choice between them will not be easy.

Christ seems to have misappreciated a point in the Homeric style. See Dr. Monro on ο 4 ff. and in his *Introduction* to B, and Rothe in *Jb.* 1902, 164 ff. The poet makes a general state-

ment, and either immediately qualifies it and makes it more precise, or, if necessary, modifies it later on. Examples are numerous. In κ 231 f., all respond to Circé's invitation,—but Eurylochus hangs back. In π 283 ff., Odysseus charges Telemachus to remove all the arms,—but in 295 bids him leave certain weapons. And so on. It is a way of saying things which is common in the poems. It has often attracted attention. A Dutch savant once went so far as to explain the inconsistency by the supposition that Pisistratus, when he was collecting the materials of the *Iliad*, had two sets of rhapsodes, a Greek and a Trojan. When the Coryphaeus of one Committee recited a verse, the opposition capped it with another of different import.—Rothe (*Jb.* 1902, 165) has an excellent illustration from Goethe. *Und sie legten sich nieder im Saale . . . und schliefen zusammen. Aber Reinecke wachte vor Angst.*

On pp. 243 and 261 Christ takes exception to the formula, K 515, οὐδ' ἀλαοσκοπίην εἰχ', as imitated from N 10. It occurs also Ξ 135 and θ 285, and the form used in Ψ 388, Ω 331 and elsewhere is of much the same intent. As Mr. Lawson says *a.l.*, the formula does not suit well in K. But must we infer imitation? He merely observes that the "local appropriateness" of the formula "must not be more severely judged than that of a fixed epithet."

Lastly, in his *Hom. od. Homdn.* Christ deals with some parallel passages in K and the *Odyssey*, but in a very summary way, decreeing imitation indiscriminately without giving reasons. K 212 from υ 264. The opposite is surely quite as likely. εὐ καὶ ἐπισταμένως, K 265, from υ 161. It is an expansion of the common ἐπισταμένως, it is also found ψ 197, and is of the *Gemeingut*. Its use in K is not altogether happy, but neither is its use in υ,—of splitting firewood. If this system he pursued far enough, the poems can be reduced to minute fragments. The passages Christ deals with are sufficient to lead him (*op. cit.* 69) to decide that K imitates the old *Odyssey* and is imitated by the Telemachy. And so, he continues, "the controversies over the relation of the Doloneia to the *Odyssey*, which have raised so much dust in recent times, are settled." But the grounds are not convincing.

Sittl (*op. cit.* 35) adds one case, K 400 = χ 371, τὸν δ' ἐπιμειδήσας προσέφη πολύμ. Ὁδ. This is a formula, used also

Δ 356 and Θ 38. But in these cases, Sittl says, there is a smile; in K there is "bitter scorn." That does not seem correct. Odysseus is amused. I see more difficulty in accepting a smile in Δ after the rebuke, *σὺ δὲ ταῦτ' ἀνεμώλια βάζεις*, administered to the King of Men by Odysseus. And see p. 203 *infra*.

This completes our review of the cases on which is based the theory that K is the work of a late poet, who supplemented the poverty of his own genius by plagiarism frequent and unashamed. The result is once more that the charge fails completely.

It would be strange if Gemoll had proved to be right, and the plagiarist of K had "imitated the great scenes" of the *Odyssey* only. Why should he, *ex hypothesi* a most unscrupulous person, and with full liberty to appropriate another poet's work, refrain from using the *Iliad* also? Gemoll's conclusion surely ought to have been that the poet of K had the *Odyssey* before him, and that, unfortunately for him, the *Iliad* was not yet in existence. But we think it can be proved that he really did plunder the *Iliad* as well.

*ὅπποῖν κ' εἰπησθα ἔπος, τοῖν κ' ἐπακούσαις.* It has been insisted above that, in any alleged case of parallelism, all the passages in the poems which are of similar wording or type, and not a mere pair of them, must be considered. We claim that, to judge K properly in this matter, all the passages in it which can be paralleled elsewhere must be examined. If Gemoll's plan is good for K and the *Odyssey*, it is good for K and the *Iliad*. If there are parallels with the *Iliad*, let us examine them with Dissecting powers.

Compare K 365 f. with X 206 f. In which place are the lines more appropriate? In K, unquestionably. The idea of any member of the *πληθύς* interfering to balk Achilles at the supreme moment of the *Iliad* is unthinkable. There is a change of attitude in regard to these passages on Dr. Leaf's part,—see note to K 368 in his first edition and his note to X 207 in his second,—which illustrates well the slenderness of the basis on which inferences of late plagiarism are based.

Next, take K 401-4 and P 75-8. In K unexceptionable. In P, on the contrary, we expect Apollo-Mentes to say, after *ἀκίχητα διώκων* in 75, "for these horses are divine and too fleet for mortal man to catch." Instead he uses words which, on Dissectors' principles, are evidently taken from K. Even Dr. Leaf admits,

on P 76 ff., that they are more suitable in K, whence they have been interpolated in P.

So for K 111 and Ω 74. In Ω we note just that departure from practice which is held to be fatal. In other such cases, as B 8, Θ 399, Λ 186, Ο 158, 221, Π 667, Zeus gives his orders to a messenger with a *βάσκ’ ἵθι, Ἰρι ταχεῖα*, or an *ἔρχεο νῦν, φίλε Φοῖβε*. In Ω 74 Iris and Apollo are present, but the late poet is ignorant of or disregards the way of the early genuine bards. K's right is unassailable.

Again, K 89 f. and I 609 f. Dr. Leaf and other authorities admit the couplet were better away from I, where it has been borrowed from K.

So for K 439 f. and Σ 82 f. The description in K, to two men who had probably never seen or even heard of Rhēsus, is most appropriate. In Σ the same glorification addressed to Thetis, who must have been familiar with Achilles' armour, is, to a Dissecting mind, absurd.

In K 68 the words *ὄνομάζων ἄνδρα ἔκαστον* are, as Dr. Leaf says, most appropriate. In X 414 f. Priam, of whom the same words are used, goes on to address the company collectively as *φίλοι*. That could not be passed. It is clear that X 415 is made up from I 11 and K 68. In innumerable cases a similar patchwork origin is assumed.

In one other case, K 45 and P 546, the lines in K are unexceptionable, while those in P are gravely suspected,—Leaf, *a.l.* We know what the decision must be.

Of another pair, Köchly (*De Il. B 1-483, disput.* 5) says boldly, “B 55 ex K 302.” Goldschmidt, *Gentagelserne*, 218, says K 302 is from B 55. There is really no ground for a decision. Other cases are K 383 and P 201; K 226 and Ψ 590; K 378 ff., Z 46 ff., and Λ 131 ff.; K 53 ff. and Z 279 ff.; K 118 and Λ 610; K 145, 172 and Π 22. More might be adduced. It is unnecessary. For, in Gemoll's words, the proprietary right of K against the rest of the *Iliad*, even against the *Mēnis*, is proved *aufs bestimmteste*, and in other cases the opposite conclusion is negatived. Therefore K is earlier than a great part of the *Iliad*.

Others besides Gemoll, as Ranke, Sickel and Orszulik, regard the author of K as a mere centoist. They give elaborate lists, and Ranke calculates that 205 out of the 579 lines in K occur in whole or in part elsewhere in the poems. Perhaps he does

not exaggerate. But we must object to any conclusion being drawn till every individual case is considered. I have not space for such an examination, but I can take another way. If the procedure is good for K, it is good for other books. Take then Λ in the *Mēnis*. Ellendt (*D.H.A.* 55 ff.) has analysed it most completely, and there is hardly a line for which a parallel cannot be found elsewhere. When exceptions occur, Ellendt seems to be astonished and marks *sic nusquam!* or *nihil simile!* The statement fills 60 pages. On this mere enumeration then, Λ is a cento like K. But Λ is of hoary antiquity, and therefore not a cento. Which is absurd. If K is to fall by any such assault, no part of the poems can stand. "There is hardly a verse in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* which is not to some extent like some other" (Rothe in *Jb.* 1889, 358).

We venture to think we may with some confidence claim a verdict favourable to K on this charge of plagiarism, one of the most serious of all that have been brought against it.

## CHAPTER XV

### THE ALLEGED ODYSSEAN CHARACTER OF I, K, Ψ, Ω

APPENDIX H contains an examination of the words, forms, etc., enumerated by Dünzter and Orszulik as peculiar to K and the *Odyssey*, and on which Odyssean affinity is imputed to K. A Unitarian expects to find such affinity; he also expects to find affinity with the rest of the *Iliad*, and he does find it, as we shall see. We have no desire to minimise affinity with the *Odyssey*. All the same, we observe that, when the particulars in the Appendix are scrutinised, there is nothing very formidable in the net result. In a certain number of cases the affinity is based on one word, phrase or line in the *Odyssey*. In not a few the similarity dwindles on examination or even vanishes altogether. In several the affinity is seen to be rather with the *Iliad*. We call special attention to the forms,—the more important of which are examined in Chap. VIII. *supra*,—and the constructions (cf. p. 267 *infra*). The proof from forms may almost be said to amount to nothing. And as to the majority of the constructions, the description seems to be incorrect. They are not peculiarities of syntax. And one last remark on the contents of App. H. They should be compared with those of App. K, drawn up for A. If words, forms, etc., prove a book Odyssean, A is certainly very Odyssean.

The Odyssean attack on K seems to fail at every point. We have seen that the uses of the Prepositions do not support it. Nor does the use of the Article. The Digamma-criterion shews that K is as ancient as A. If we take Dr. Monro's Odyssean usages enumerated by Miss Stawell on pp. 98 ff. of her work, we find there are just 5 that have been detected in K. Of these 4 are prepositional, and have been discussed in Chap. IX. *supra*. The fifth is  $\epsilon i \gamma \alpha \rho$  with the opt. But nothing can be

argued from it. There are 9 other instances in the *Iliad*, 2 of them in X, and only 11 in the *Odyssey*, so it cannot be called a merely Odyssean use. For vocabulary pure and simple we refer to the paper already quoted p. 28 *supra*. Parallel passages we have considered in Chap. XIV., and the Versification in Chap. XIII. There is nothing against K under either head. It seems that this part of the case against K is quite unreal.

But what of affinity with the *Iliad*? No one, as far as we are aware, has ever considered this. A few words and phrases that are found outside K only in the *Odyssey* were discovered, and a notion of some special connection between the two was suggested. The number of these expressions was increased by further examination, and the parallel passages were made to confirm the idea. K was clearly "Odyssean." As it was Odyssean, it could not be Iliadic, so no one has thought of enquiring if it be. But we venture to make the attempt. It has been suggested in *C.Q.* iv. 77, that if certain phenomena appearing only in K and the *Odyssey* prove affinity between K and the *Odyssey* and dissociate it from the *Iliad*, then similar phenomena found only in K and the rest of the *Iliad* will prove the same kind of affinity between K and the *Iliad* and dissociate it from the *Odyssey*. And it does not seem to matter what the precise nature of the affinity is. It will be the same in the one case as in the other.

The suggestion is that K was composed by some more or less late poet of an inferior Odyssean status, and that he himself or, at a later period, some Diaskeuast or *Ordner*, managed to insert the lay or get it inserted in the *Iliad*, where its unsuitability to its environment is apparent in many ways, especially in certain Odyssean characteristics. But suppose now that the unknown agency which gave this foreign lay a place in the *Iliad* had had better taste, and, considering its obviously Odyssean nature, had attached it to the *Odyssey*. This might easily have been done. There is in the *Odyssey*, § 457 ff., a small *Νυκτεγερσία*, a miniature Doloneia without a Dolon or a Rhēsus. The unknown friend of the homeless, unacknowledged Doloneia might very well have put it in the *Odyssey* after § 456. A little alteration of the opening of Odysseus' speech, 462 ff., would have been necessary, but such modifications were, Dissectors ask us to believe, easily made. Think of the doctoring of I in the interests

of K. The necessary change could have been made in the present case, and the Νυκτεγερσία could have been converted into a tale of Troy and of Iliadic times,—a sort of Εύμαιον ἀπόλογος. Let us suppose then that it had been done, and that the Doloneia had come down to us as part and parcel of the *Odyssey*. What would modern critics, acting on the principles they have applied to K as part of the *Iliad*, have said then, especially if they had found a hint in Eustathius that the παλαιοί believed that this Doloneia in the *Odyssey* was originally an independent lay? A connection between it and the *Iliad* would have been inferred, and there would have been no difficulty in shewing that it was unsuited to the Odyssean setting, as being altogether Iliadic in character. A lay of such proportions, relating an episode in the war before Troy, and so perfectly adapted to follow a defeat of the Greeks in the course of that war, must have been composed by one of the poets of the *Iliad*, and must have found a place in the *Odyssey* by one of those mistakes which meddlers occasionally made. And would not its proper place have been discovered at once? Would not a gap requiring to be filled have been found between I, with the spirits of the Achaeans at the lowest point, and the beginning of Λ, where they move out to battle with the greatest ardour? Would not the association of Odysseus and Diomede in Λ and their evident separation from their men, have been held to point to some previous enterprise which they had undertaken together, and would not the very thing wanted have been found in the Doloneia in the *Odyssey*? We think, knowing what we do of the methods of Dissectors, that this might very well have been their procedure. But the crown of the scheme would have been the close similarity of the language of the lay to that of the *Iliad*. The results which an examination of that language by Orszulik, after Duntzer and others, would have produced, are summarised in Appendix I. They deserve to be studied. They are really more abundant than Orszulik's indications of Odyssean affinity. And the Digamma, the versification, the prepositions and the parallel passages would all have been found to support the Iliadic character of the episode, which would soon have been expelled from the *Odyssey*.

But let us stop supposing. K is in the *Iliad*. There is a mass of evidence to prove its affinity with the rest of that poem.

We may grant to Dissectors that they have proved some affinity with the *Odyssey*. And we are content to leave the matter in that position.

A few words in conclusion about the grouping of I, K, Ψ and Ω as Odyssean. It seems to be an idea which has gathered strength from mere repetition, being one that suited the views that the majority of critics are inclined to. It is wholly a question of language. Dr. Leaf observes (vol. ii. xiv.) that the "Latest Expansions," which include these four books, "are thoroughly in the spirit of those which precede, and are only separated from them on account of linguistic evidence, which definitely classes them with the *Odyssey* rather than the rest of the *Iliad*." And cf. Jebb, 139, and for Ψ and Ω, 161. This evidence was at length collected by Dr. Monro in the *H.G.*, and for years no one thought of questioning the conclusion suggested.

We do not, however, find that there has been absolute agreement. The majority agree as to the four books. But opinions differ much as to whether other parts of the *Iliad* are Odyssean or not. The case of Θ is interesting. A common view is that it is a late book, and that it was composed as a "prologue" to I (Leaf, vol. ii. xii., and Christ, *H.G.L.*<sup>4</sup> 46). In that case, as Mr. Lang has remarked, it should shew signs of Odyssean weakness. But no critic has ever indicated any. Father Browne, however (*Handbook*, 111), calls it "Odyssean,"—on what ground is not clear. Even as to the four books there are differences (*C.Q.* iv. 76). Blass (*Interpol.* 296) discusses the Odyssean affinity of Ψ and Ω, but says nothing about I and K. Dr. Monro (see Chap. XIII. *supra*) finds that certain irregularities of versification appear in Ψ and Ω, but not in I and K. Again, we observe that he seems unwilling to detach I from the *Iliad*. See Mr. Andrew Lang on the point in the *Athenaeum* of 29th January 1910. If I must belong to the *Iliad*, and yet is shewn by its language to be of the same age as the *Odyssey*, then there is, it seems to me, an argument for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* being of the same period. Christ's attitude to Ω, *l.c.*, seems to be just the attitude that Dr. Monro adopts towards I, and it is clear from *Hom. od. Homdn.* 15, that he did not estimate very highly this theory of Odysseanism generally. Rothe has remarked (*Jb.* 1907, 324) that K has little in common with the other Odyssean books. Cauer in his *Grdfrgn.* seems to me to find few late traits

in it compared with I and Ψ. Düntzer, who is one of the great upholders of the Odyssean character of K, defends Ω in *Hom. Abh.* 326 ff. He does not attempt to prove it Odyssean. And so on. And it has been pointed out in *C.Q., l.c.*, that it often happens, when the *Iliad* has been broken up by the application of some test, that the four books are not associated in one solid block, but are distributed through late and early strata.

Miss Stawell has now examined the evidence adduced by Dr. Monro in a most careful manner, and has had no difficulty in shewing that these peculiarities of diction form no bond between Ψ and Ω and the *Odyssey*. We have given reasons for our conclusion that the same may be said for K. There remains I, for which I refer to *C.Q.* iv. 79. The analysis there given shews that very little Odysseanism can be imputed to I, and all four books may be said to be vindicated against the alleged Odyssean taint.

We suggest that, if there is greater similarity in language between these four books and the *Odyssey* than between the other books of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the reason is to be found in a certain sameness in point of subject matter. A good illustration is to be found in Dr. Monro's note on p. 334 of his *Odyssey*. It is there stated that four words common in the *Odyssey* occur in the *Iliad* only in I, K, Ω. Three of them are descriptive of beds or bedding. Of these δέμυνα occurs once in Ω, ρῆγος once in I and once in Ω, and κῶας once in I. These are just the books of the *Iliad* where we expect to find them. Strangely enough, not one of the three is to be found in K, which is supposed to be Odyssean, like I and Ω, and which ought more than either, if regard be had to the scenes described in it, to have used Odyssean words of the kind. But to take a larger view. A great part of the *Iliad* is concerned with fighting, fighting between armies in the field. In the books describing the encounters we find very little linguistic affinity with the *Odyssey*, in which there is very little of warlike achievement. But there are other tracts of the *Iliad* which are not concerned with fighting, and among them are I, K, Ψ and Ω, and it need not surprise us that their language and that of the more peaceful poem should shew a certain amount of correspondence (*C.Q.* iv. 78). A itself is unlike many other books of the *Iliad*, and like the *Odyssey*, in this, that it does not relate to battle, and we shall find later

(App. K) that, on purely linguistic phenomena, it must be regarded as very Odyssean. We have already observed that it is strange that the critics have not discovered that Θ is Odyssean in language, though composed as a prologue to Odyssean I. The reason no doubt is that Θ is a book of battle.

The same point was taken long ago by Packard in a review of Geddes' *Problem* in the *Amer. Journ. of Philol.* i. 40 ff. He found that Geddes "ignored too much the influence that the poet's subject has upon his use of words and upon his representations of life and character." The general difference of subject between Geddes' Achillean and Ulyssean books is noted. To take an instance. E is the book that "on Geddes' system of comparison has more points of resemblance to the Achillean books than any other of its Ulyssean companions." The reason is that it is, like the former, full of fighting. The result of an examination of the language of a battle-scene in Λ is given in *C.Q., l.c.*

We might add other considerations. Much of the action of the "Odyssean" books takes place during the night,—in fact the whole of that of I and K, and nearly the whole of Ω. Very little of what takes place in the rest of the *Iliad* is enacted during the hours of darkness. On the other hand, in the *Odyssey* we have a great deal. Here is certainly a bond. The expressions that this requires in the narrative have often been noted. It will also be found that, like the *Odyssey*, some of the Odyssean books have proportionately more lines in speeches than the other books of the *Iliad* have. See p. 39 *supra*. And finally, the Odyssean books agree with the *Odyssey* in having fewer similes than the rest of the *Iliad*. How this affects the language has also been shewn (p. 39 *supra*). The greater number of the similes in the *Iliad* are to be found in the battle scenes.

Mr. Lawson, in the Introduction to his edition of I and K, has suggested an explanation of the Odyssean character of the Doloneia. Odysseus plays a leading part in both it and the *Odyssey*. If in certain districts of ancient Greece, say the extreme west, the rhapsodes found Odysseus a more popular hero than Achilles, they would probably recite K in conjunction with the *Odyssey*, when in that part of the country. Then "what more natural, nay inevitable, than the transfer from the

one to the other of certain words and phrases?" Compare Zarncke, *Entstg. d. griech. Literatursprach.* 3, H.G. 396, and Seymour, *Life*, 16. This must seem a likely result to those, and they are many, who believe that the rhapsodes left their mark on the text. But on that point we have ventured to be sceptical (pp. 21 f. *supra*). And we think we have found on the face of the *Iliad* a sufficient explanation of such affinity with the *Odyssey* as K displays.

## CHAPTER XVI

### POSITION OF K IN THE *ILIAD*

ΦΑΣΙ ΔΕ ΟΙ ΠΑΛΑΙΟΙ

WE now leave the language and turn to the lay itself as one of the constituent parts of the *Iliad*. And first as to its position in that poem. It is a trite remark, and one that meets us in nearly every review of the structure of the *Iliad*, that there is a want of connection between K and the rest of the poem. Cut it out, say the critics, and the *Iliad* is none the worse for the excision. The lay is compact, complete in itself, and easily removable, one of the *Einzellieder* of the poems *par excellence*.

This might be said with almost equal force of other parts of the poems. But what adds sting to the remark about the isolation of K, is an old story that K was not part of the original scheme of the *Iliad*, but was tacked on to it by Pisistratus. Much of the obloquy from which K has suffered is due to this. It has encouraged adverse criticism. *Historia loquitur!* A doubt is raised. The story must mean that K is a late intruder into the Homeric fold, and *omnia praesumuntur contra spoliatorem*.

Eustathius says, 785, 41 f., φασὶ δὲ οἱ παλαιοὶ τὴν ῥαψῳδίαν ταύτην ὑφ' Ομήρου ἴδιᾳ τετάχθαι καὶ μὴ ἐγκαταλεγῆναι τοῖς μέρεσι τῆς Ἰλιάδος, ὑπὸ δὲ Πεισιστράτου τετάχθαι εἰς τὴν ποίησιν, and the schol. T repeats the story in terms so similar, that it is certain that either the one borrowed from the other or both from the same source.<sup>1</sup> The statement has been much discussed, but mostly with reference to the Pisistratean action

<sup>1</sup> The story is also found in the scholia on Dionysius Thrax, which I have not seen. But I observe that they are the source of the wonderful statement, which Eustathius accepted, that Aristarchus and Zenodotus assisted Pisistratus (Dugas-Montbel, *Hist. des poés. Hom.* 9 ff.).

generally. Against K its effect has been quietly assumed. A summary, up to 1881, of the opinions expressed about it, is given by Ranke, 3 ff. Some saw historical truth in it, others merely conjecture. Who these *παλαιοί* were no one could tell. Various guesses were made. But some of the learned refrained from speculating, and wisely, seeing there was so little to go upon. And there is not more now than there was when Ranke wrote. Any critic who wants to discredit K points to the story and thinks that is enough. H. Wolf (*Homers Ilias*, 41) calls it a "very weighty notice." It would be, if we could believe it. Professor Murray (165 n.) says it is a "very ancient note." We may also call it a quite modern note. Principal Geddes, who is not a believer in the formation of the *Iliad* by Pisistratus (*Problem*, 336), but nevertheless accepts Eustathius' report about K, surely reads as much as it is possible to read into it when he says (*ibid.* 41) that K, "though *expressly said* by the ancient critics to be composed 'by Homer,' was yet *confidently pronounced* to have been a separate composition and an after addition." And generally it may be said to be assumed that the story is bad for our Book. We think that that has been too hastily assumed, and we shall therefore consider the matter afresh for ourselves.

We begin with the reference to Pisistratus. Can it be believed that he made the *Iliad* out of a number of lays *σποράδην τὸ πρὶν ἀειδόμενα*? If so, Eustathius' story will appear credible. If not, or if we hold that the evidence only tends to prove, or gives some reason for suspecting, that Pisistratus was responsible for an interpolation, or made an official copy of the poems, or regulated their recitation on state occasions, we shall of course find no support to the story from the mention of the tyrant's name.

It is impossible, in the face of a mass of learned opinion which is quite overwhelming, to take a serious view of the Pisistratean pretensions. Dr. Leaf, who is the great representative of Dissection in Great Britain, was formerly at one with the majority and consequently discarded the tale about K. But in his second edition (vol. i. xix. ff.) he changed his view. His chief reason for scepticism had been the silence of the Aristarchean scholia regarding Pisistratus. But this vanished before Wilamowitz' proof (*H.U.* 240 f.) that Dieuchidas of Megara, referred to in a

well-known passage of Diogenes Laertius, wrote in the fourth century B.C. This discovery had caused "a clear reaction" in regard to Pisistratus. So Dr. Leaf adopted the Recension "as a postulate,"<sup>1</sup> and with this change of view on a point of such cardinal importance for the critical treatment of the *Iliad*, came a change in his attitude towards the story about K. It corresponds "too closely with the probabilities to allow us to treat it as a mere empty guess."

The literature of the Homeric Question shews that there has been no such reaction since the period, say 1882-8, during which Wilamowitz' work and Dr. Leaf's first edition appeared. The discovery about Dieuchidas did not convert Wilamowitz himself (*H.U.* 255). The reaction was in fact represented by Erhardt and Cauer,<sup>2</sup> to both of whom Dr. Leaf, in the preface to his second edition, acknowledges a special debt. Cauer's review (*Grundfragen*,<sup>1</sup> 81 ff.) of the evidence, if it may be so called, is very full. But there is nothing that is new in it except the one fact about Dieuchidas. Cauer's second edition, 1909, contains but little addition to the controversy, and I note that he does not refer to Dr. Monro's careful examination and decisive condemnation of the Pisistratean legend. And see Mr. Snow in *C.R.* xxiv. 185. There is perhaps reason to believe that Pisistratus did something. But, as Rothe expresses it, in *Jb.* 1896, 185, that something need not have been essentially different from the so-called "recensions" of later times. See also Harder's review of Cauer's second edition in *Wocht. k. P.* 1909, 732.

On the other hand the stream of criticism unfavourable to Pisistratus' claim to have made the *Iliad*, has flowed on undisturbed by the attempts of Erhardt, Cauer and Leaf to stem it. To prove that, I give very briefly all the views of prominent Homeric scholars since the period mentioned, that I have been able to find. Gemoll, *Jb. Bursian*, 1888, 23, and Flach, *Peisistr.*

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Leaf does not appear to me to make the nature of this Recension very clear. It seems doubtful whether he believes there was an *Iliad*, or only unconnected lays, before the time of Pisistratus. But the value of the postulate for purposes of disruption can hardly be overestimated. Whether the *Ordner* made an *Iliad* for the first time, or only restored a unity which had been disturbed,—*sacri lacerum collegit corpus Homeri*,—he is assumed by critics to

have had power to add, subtract, substitute, transfer, join, harmonise, smooth over and alter. Such an assumption makes the task of disintegration quite easy.

<sup>2</sup> Erhardt, *Entstg.* 1894; Cauer, *Grundfragen*,<sup>1</sup> 1895. See reviews of Cauer, unfavourable to his conclusions about Pisistratus, by Rothe in *Jb.* 1896, 185, and by Peppmüller in *B. ph. Wocht.* 1896, 97 ff.

*u. seine litter. Thätigkeit.* 1885, 30 (Lehrs and Ludwich have settled the question). Mahaffy, *H.G.L.<sup>3</sup>* 1901, 54 and 60 (Grote's refutation final). Murray, *H.G.L.* 1907, 10 ff. (Pisistratus did something which gave an opportunity for interpolation). Jevons, *H.G.L.* 1889, 29 ff.; Strickland, *La Quest. Omerica*, 1893, 32 ff.; Terret, *Homère*, 1899, 40; Drerup, *Homer*, 1903, 9 and 37; Pierron, *H.G.L.<sup>16</sup>* 1906, 83 f., cf. his *Iliad*, Introduction, iii. ff.; and Finsler, *Homer*, 1908, 245,—all against. Croiset, Kammer, and Robert appear not to deal with the question. Jebb, *Homer*, 1887, 114 f. (story doubtful and vague; accepted, it does not disprove original unity). Browne, *Handbook*, 1905, 25 f. (at most, text settled). Ludwich, *Die hom. Frag. u. ihre Beantwortg.* 1904, 7, and cf. *Der blinde Mann von Chios*, 1904, 12 ff. (more than mere *Einzellieder* before Pisistratus). Christ, *H.G.L.<sup>4</sup>* 1905, 65 (all now agreed Wolf and Lachmann went too far). Sortais, *Ilios et Iliade*, 1892, 83 (*insoutenable*). So Bertrin, *La Quest. Hom.* 1897, 87 ff. Bréal, 1906, 62 f. (last additions to *Iliad* before it was brought to Athens). Allen, *C.R.* 1907, 18 (if any conclusion can be drawn, only that Pisistratus recalled the rhapsodes to their book). Mackail, *Procgs. Class. Assocn.* 1908, 13 (Pisistratus' work only a reconstitution). And lastly see the thorough, one might surely say definitive, reviews of the whole question by Dr. Monro, *Odyssey*, 1901, 402 ff. (on which Agar in *C.R.* xvi. 122), and Mr. Lang, *H. and A.* 1906, 32-50. The claims of Pisistratus are there absolutely rejected. Dr. Monro even thinks the date of Dieuchidas unimportant. But in fact, as there is admittedly a lacuna in the account of Diogenes Laertius (Düntzer and Rothe in *Jb.* 1891, 103), no one knows exactly what it was that Dieuchidas said, for the critics fill up the gap in different ways. The discovery of a papyrus might upset all their conjectures. Düntzer appears even to question Wilamowitz' proof about Dieuchidas. In any case, as Mr. Lang points out (*op. cit.* 45), Dieuchidas wrote, "as a partisan in an historical dispute." But all we have proposed to ourselves is to shew there has been no reaction. That seems quite clear. But to a few extremists we feel it will not avail to quote authority. *οὐ γὰρ πείσεις οὐδὲ ἦν πείσης.* They will never desert Pisistratus.

His name, however, does not help our story. The next point is the phrase *ἰδίᾳ τετάχθαι*. Is it genuine? In *τετάχθαι εἰς τὴν ποίησιν* the verb is quite in place, but for the use with *ἰδίᾳ*

none of its ordinary meanings seems to suit. Very few of those who quote the Greek give a translation. Professor Murray (165 n.) gives "drawn up by itself." But *τάσσω* never bore the sense of "draw up (a document)"? And if "draw up" here means "arrange," "array," "marshal," how could that be done to the Doloneia "by itself" at its birth? Lachmann's *besonders gesetzt*, Wolf's *factum pro singulari opusculo*, and Finsler's *einzelne geordnet gewesen* (p. 518) seem equally objectionable. If *τετάχθαι* is corrupt, *iδίᾳ* may be wrong also.

But assume that the critics are right in taking the tale to mean that the Doloneia was composed as an independent lay, and not as part of the *Iliad*. It goes on to say that K was composed *ὑφ' Ομῆρον*. These words have received remarkably little attention (Volkmann, *Nachträge*, ii. 10). But it is a good old rule for the interpretation of a document that the whole of the context must be read together. In the present case it is said that the lay was written by Homer, that is, by him who, according to ancient belief, wrote the rest of the *Iliad*. Which is just what stamps the story as absurd on its face. K has no *raison d'être* apart from the situation which was the result of the battle in Θ, and which was intensified by the failure of the *Presbeia* in I. It is not the case that K "might be inserted at almost any point" (Miss Stawell, *H. and Il.* 21). Grote's words stand (ii. 119),—"it is framed with great specialty for the antecedent circumstances under which it occurs, and would suit for no other place." It is part and parcel of the story of the *Iliad*,—the same scene, the same characters, the same divinities favouring the same heroes. See Niese, *Entwickelung*, 24 f. How are we to conceive of it as "independently" composed by the author of the rest of the *Iliad*? If proof from the contents of the lay is required, we may ask, with Nitsche (p. 12), how the author of an independent lay could select the hour or two before the dawn for the expedition? Odysseus says, K 251, "the night is far spent; the dawn is at hand." The line cannot be "cut out." It has never been suspected, though 252 f. have. We must have Odysseus' assent to Diomede's proposal. The line is consistent with all that goes before, and seems conclusive against the theory of an *Einzellied*. Lange (*Jb.* 1880, 142) reviewing Kuhlbars, approves a similar suggestion based on the introductory part of the lay. See also Rothe in *Jb.* 1909, 227.

If the story is not credible in itself, it is hardly necessary to enquire who the *παλαιοί* were. On that point the critics are hopelessly divided. The Alexandrians are generally favoured. Lachmann (*Fern. Betrachtgn.* 26; on which see Ludwich, *Ar.* ii. 394 n.) has no doubt about it; Eustathius, *wie jeder Kenner weiss*, means by "the men of old" the grammarians of Alexandria. Volkmann, on the other hand (*Gesch. u. Krit.* 228 n.), quotes Lehrs' *Pindarscholien*, 167, as shewing that *oi παλαιοί* is Eustathius' usual expression for the treatises from which he derived his information, "and which might be quite modern." (See Neumann (*Eustath. als krit. Quelle f. d. Iliastext*, 181) for Eustathius' sources.) Bergk (547, 598 n.) thinks of the very old writers on Homer, as Theagenes. See also Düntzer (pp. 2 ff.), Sengebusch (*Hom. Diss.* ii. 44), Pierron on K 1, E Meyer (*Herm.* xxvii. 371 n.), Erhardt (*op. cit.* 162), *Euch.* xxx., and Römer (*Hom. Gestalt. u. Gestaltgn.* 17). It is all speculation. We know nothing (Ludwich, *l.c.*). Some "nameless commentators" (Mure, i. 265) made a conjecture. The observed detachability of K would easily give rise to it, especially in the time when, as Lehrs says (*Ar.* 444), it became the fashion to ascribe suspicious parts of the poems to Pisistratus and his learned coadjutors, "of whom Zenodotus and Aristarchus were the chief."

One word more about the story. Does it not place Dissectors in this dilemma? If Pisistratus collected the lays which now form the other 23 books of the *Iliad*, and at the same time added K, making the whole into the *Iliad* as we now have it, there is surely nothing to the discredit of K by comparison with the rest of the lays. But if we are to believe that he took K, which was out in the world by itself, an outcast from what was an already formed Homeric communion, and incorporated it with the rest of the *Iliad*, which was by this time a poem so far complete in itself, then we must abandon the action ascribed to him as the creator of the *Iliad*.

It may be added that M. Pottier has described in *Monuments Piot*, xvi. 107 ff., a Corinthian vase on which Dolon is represented, along with two other scenes from the *Iliad*. He believes that the figure of Dolon is taken from *une composition plus importante, bas-relief ou peinture*, and argues that the episode of Dolon was already part of the Homeric Epopee in the 7th century. And Pisistratus was not born till about 600 (E. Curtius, *Hist. Gr.* 6 i. 341).

To sum up. The story, to have any value, depends on a view of the Pisistratean activity which the vast majority of scholars reject. The wording is doubtful. Where the language is precise, it tells in favour of the authenticity of K. No one knows its origin. It leaves the opponents of the unity of the *Iliad* in a dilemma. *οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος.* Yet, as has been said, it is in no small measure due to this piece of small talk that K has fallen to its present low estate.

*Note.*—Since this chapter was written, Wilamowitz' paper on Θ has appeared (*Sitzungsber. d. königl. preuss. Akad. d. Wissn.* 1910, xxi.). He holds that Θ was composed in order to bring I and K, then *Einzellieder*, into the *Iliad*. He does not (p. 382) regard K as very modern, and, as he believes Θ was written in the 7th century, he must reject altogether the story told by the *παλαιοί*.

## CHAPTER XVII

### POSITION OF K IN THE *ILIAD*—MODERN VIEW

IF we turn from the ancients to the moderns, we find that the popular view is that an *Iliad* once existed without a Doloneia. Then a late bard, noticing there was time in the night between Θ and Λ for something more, determined to fill it up, and either invented a new adventure for himself or worked up bits of saga that had been overlooked. There were legends about Diomede,—according to Professor Murray (188 ff.), following Bethe and others, about two individuals of that name, one “a fierce and fiery young warrior, much associated with horses” (cf. Studniczka, *Kyrene*, 139), the other an “‘unsympathetic’ Diomedes, a ruffian and a savage,”—even γαμβροκτόνος (*Eustath.* on K 531). There would also be in the *Troica* a tradition of Dolon, a herald’s son and a feeble creature, and of his attempt to spy in the Achaean camp. All this the late bard worked up into a lay. It was a poor thing, but his own. But, although it was his own, he gave it up to mankind for the *Iliad*, and although it was poor, the *Iliad* was glad to take it and keep it. This was the view of Grote (ii. 119 f.), and it is remarkable for the dictum by which he supports it. K “has not the slightest bearing upon the events of the eleventh or the following books. . . . And this is one mark of a portion subsequently inserted—that though fitted on to the parts which precede, it has no influence on those which follow.” And other high authorities agree, as Nitzsch (*Sagenp.* 224), “the unsuitability to the action is our ground,” or E. Meyer (*Hom. u. d. II.* 136), “it stands in the midst zwecklos da.”

But even if we admit the presence of Grote’s mark, it will only follow that K was inserted after the rest of the *Iliad* was complete, not that it was composed and inserted by a new author. The poet of the rest of the *Iliad*, assuming for the moment that

there was only one, may have composed K as an afterthought, as Mure (i. 266) thinks possible. A poet may enlarge his plan (Friedländer, *Hom. Krit.* 68). The lays may not have been composed in their present order. See *Jb.* 1891, 282, and 1902, 128, and Jäger (*Hom. Aph.* 186, and *Hom. u. Hor.* 101), who quotes a letter from Wieland about *Oberon*. K may even have been the last of all. Tennyson did not make his *Idylls* in the order in which they are now arranged. The same may be said of Vergil and the *Aeneid* (Heinze, 259, Albrecht in *Hermes* xvi., and *Jb.*, l.c.). No one will impugn the story of Nisus and Euryalus because, as Heinze admits (p. 446), it has no influence on the books that come after it. And see Rothe (*Grenzboten*, 1896, 427 f.) on Schiller's *Don Carlos* and some other works. The *Canterbury Tales* were not all composed as parts of a predesigned whole. Again, a poem planned and composed *aus einem Guss* may be afterwards altered in certain parts. Even a new incident, as a *Patrokleia*, might be introduced (*Jb.*, *ut sup.*, and Gercke in *Jahrb. k. A.*, 1901, 185). Matter which is part of a work thought out *ab initio* may be loose in its setting; still more may a passage added as an afterthought, or one which has been recast. See Jusserand on *Piers Plowman* in *Modern Philology* for January 1910.

Again, Grote's principle appears to run counter to the assumption made by Dissectors, that any one had a free hand to interpolate the epics, and also to alter the text to make the new matter harmonise with it. If, for example, a poet wished to make certain gods interfere in the battles of the *Iliad*, he could do so. And if he or a successor found that any such interference conflicted with the edict of Zeus in Θ 5 ff., he could (Leaf, a.l.) add lines 28-40 to cure the discrepancy. How then, we may ask, could the author of K, or he who later inserted it in the *Iliad*, be so indifferent to the fate of the lay? One small interpolation would have assured its position in the *Iliad* forever. A few lines introduced into one of the speeches of Odysseus or Diomede in Λ, or into the colloquy of Nestor and Agamemnon in Ξ, would have sufficed. Or an addition, to supply the reference to the horses of Rhēsus which the critics miss so much, say at Ψ 292, as (*sit venia numeris*)—Αἰνείαν· ‘Ρήσοιο δ’ ἐύτριχες ὠκέες ἵπποι ἐν φάτνῃ ἐλίποντο, ἐπεὶ πολὺ χείρονες ἡσαν, θυητοὶ ἔόντες, τὰ δ’ ἄρ’ ἀγήρω ἀθανάτω τε. We must surely

refuse to follow Grote, or decline to believe it was so easy to interpolate the poems.—We may apply this to A. The interpolations in it noted by Dr. Leaf are of incomprehensible origin. One is “a pointless generality,” another is “gnomic,” a third “spoils the picture,” and so on. Not one seems to be designed to help the additions which late poets made to the *Iliad*. Yet nothing could have secured the inviolability say of I, so well as a few lines inserted in A. They would have made an incontestable voucher.

And finally, those who accept Grote’s ruling must deny isolated episodes to an epic poem altogether. But surely that is not a justifiable attitude. It is a special application of the unreasonable canon of Dissecting criticism that anything that can be cut out clean may be suspected. Those who use it do not stop to think how other authors’ works can be mutilated, if such procedure be sanctioned. The prejudice against episodes in Dissecting minds is easily explained. Everything that retards the plot is questioned. An episode retards, so it is suspected. See Allen in *C.R.* xx. 270. Herodotus wanders, and retards. “By means of digressions he achieved epic variety” (Bury, *Anct. Gk. Historians*, 41 f.). Other writers digress at times. Other epics have episodes interspersed through them, and commentators make no objection. The *Sháhnáma*, which some call an epic, is a collection of magnified episodes. We find them in *Beowulf* and the *Idylls*. There are episodes in the *Aeneid* (Heinze, 438). Some, as Bernhardy, maintain that the epos requires episodes. Certainly. They are an obvious source of variety. Aristotle approved of them (*Poetics*, 1459 a). Terret (p. 235) styles K an *épisode de transition*, which could not be expected to influence the subsequent action. Bäumlein, quoted by Hiecke (*Der gegenwärt. Stand d. hom. Frage*, 25), thinks that self-evident. See also Blackie (*Hom. and the Il.* i. 257), Mure (i. 297 ff.), Cordery (*The Il. of Hom.* i. 482), and Bougot (pp. 214 ff.). If such a means of varying the story be denied the poet, then the critics’ complaint,—an unreasonable complaint, as Jäger shews (*Hom. u. Hor.* 86), of the long drawn out Fighting at the Wall and at the Ships should be suppressed. The *Iliad* should have been one continued, unvaried surfeit of φόνος τε καὶ αἷμα καὶ ἄργαλέος στόνος ἀνδρῶν, with no *Ruhepunkt* at all. And what would the critics have said then? They would have complained

even more bitterly of the monotony. As an episode the Doloneia justifies itself. As an episode introducing us to the interior of the camp and then providing an adventure by night which, for the moment, turns the tables, it is admirably conceived and most effectively placed.

It now remains to be seen whether there is, as the critics assume, a total absence of connection between K and the rest of the *Iliad*. Has K, as Grote says, not the slightest bearing upon the events of the following books? Does it stand *zwecklos da*?

Many say no, for the following reason. If the author of Θ and I was preparing for the Greek success and the *Aristeia* of Agamemnon which he actually gives us in Λ, something must be done to raise the spirits of the army and its leader. Rothe, who thinks that the Doloneia "is not at all so superfluous as is generally supposed" (*Jb.* 1891, 284, and cf. 1889, 355), makes this same point, though he thinks Kocks' "no, were the Doloneia not there, we should miss it," goes too far. So Mure (i. 266, 301), Nutzhorn (*Entstg.* 223 n.), Schmid (*Hom. Stud.* ii. 19), Gerlach (quoted by Ranke, p. 9), Stier (*Introduction to K*), Kiene (*Die Epen des Homers*, pt. ii. 93), and Jäger (*Hom. u. Hor.* 82, and *Hom. Aph.* 226). I can add the authority of Christ (*H.G.L.* 4 46), though he thinks it was a late Homerid who seized the situation,—not to mention Unitarians, as Gladstone, Lang, and others already quoted above. Mr. Allen agrees (*C.R.* xx. 194) that the Doloneia "has always held its present place." It is necessary, of course, that we appreciate to the full the points in the story of the Doloneia, and bring to bear on it, what is too often wanting in Homeric criticism, a little imagination. I have tried to bring out the points of the story in Chap. I. If they are correctly stated, the rise in the spirits of the force behind the wall would correspond to the chagrin and dismay of Hector, when he learned what its leaders were still capable of. Brandt (*Jahrb. k. P.* 1888, 102) holds that this heartening of the Achaeans is the poet's object. Cf. Terret, 236, and Plüss in *N. J. f. klass. Altertum*, 1909, 318. Brandt adds that the expedition had to be at night and a not too conspicuous event, because of Θ 5 ff. and 399 ff. That the Achaeans marched out in high fettle in Λ we know. But objectors urge that that is explained by the action of Zeus in

sending Eris to shout new life into them. The objection, however, is not insuperable. That seems to be only the poet's way of representing the change in the Achaeans' spirits. It is frequently the case in the poems that a theophany appears to have a figurative meaning, and is not to be taken literally. The appearance of Athené in the Quarrel in A is often quoted in this connection. And I would refer to some excellent remarks, on the interventions in both poems by this same goddess, to be found in Miss Stawell's work, especially pp. 79 and 170 f.

But there are also some notes of connection between K and the other books of the *Iliad*. It occurred to me that the reference to the shields of Nestor and his son, in Ξ 9 ff., had something to do with the proceedings of the preceding night in K, and Mr. Lang has (*H. and A.* 276 f.) stated the argument in the clearest possible way. He informs me that no reviewer has controverted it. No other explanation has ever been suggested. Dr. Leaf thought it useless to enquire. The explanation from the Doloneia seems perfectly reasonable and acceptable. If it is accepted, there is a reference in Ξ to the events of K, and K is incontestably part and parcel of the *Iliad* as much as Ξ.

So, though not quite so clearly, in the case of Meriones, who gave Odysseus his bow on the night of the Doloneia. Next day, N 159, he spears at Deiphobus and breaks his spear. He has not a second one. Possibly, when he went on guard the night before, he took only one spear, as he had his bow with him. In N he returns to camp to fetch a spear. Dr. Leaf argues, on τοι in 256, for which there is a *v.l.* πον, and from Idomeneus' words in 260 ff., that Meriones got one from the hut of his chief. But that is not quite clear. If Meriones visited his own hut, he may have recovered his bow at the same time, for he has it and uses it in 650. The bow may be conceived by the poet as having been restored by Odysseus to Meriones' hut, as Thrasymedes' shield was by Diomede to Nestor's. Odysseus must have got himself a spear before coming out in the morning, for he had not one the night before, and he has one in Λ,—it is expressly mentioned in line 447. He may have also restored the bow. All this is at least very consistent with the hypothesis that K, Λ, N, and Ξ are the work of one author.

The fact that Odysseus and Diomede appear at a late stage in the fight in Λ, and by themselves, has always seemed to me to point in the same direction. In the end of K the pair are left sitting at a meal. They are next mentioned in Λ 310 ff. Much has happened since dawn. Agamemnon has routed the Trojans, and Hector has in turn routed the Achaeans. Odysseus and Diomede suddenly appear and stem the flight. There are no other chiefs near them, and we do not hear of their own contingents. It is as if their men had moved out with the rest early in the morning, leaving the two heroes to follow. After a time Diomede is wounded, mounts a car and retires, but there is no mention of Sthenelus. The car may have been one of those left at the fosse, Λ 47 ff. And when he goes, Odysseus is all by himself, 401. Not a follower is near. Wounded and surrounded by the Trojans, he has to shout for help. Menelaus hears him, evidently, 465 ff., from some distance. The whole narrative is consistent, but one expression makes difficulty, *πάλιν ὄρμένω* in 326, if it be interpreted, as by Leaf, “rallying (from flight).” That seems going too far. But the *πάλιν* is not suitable to our theory. *τὼ δ' ἀν' ὅμιλον ιόντε* in 324 is. *πάλιν ὄρμένω* does not recur; and if we could suggest corruption and read *πρόσω πόρμένω*,—cf. *ὅρμενα πρόσσω* in 572,—the case would be complete. But there is no MS. authority. It would not be the only case in the poems in which two readings give opposite meanings. In N 214 we have both *ἥτεν ἐκ κλισίης* and *ἐς κλισίην*.—Terret (p. 235) takes the *τί παθόντε, κ.τ.λ.*, of Odysseus to Diomede, Λ 313, as a reference to their adventure of the night before. It is possible it is so meant. We cannot say more.

And again, there is a somewhat striking similarity between the colloquy of Nestor and Agamemnon in Ξ and their conversation in K. In the latter, K 104 ff., for which see p. 157 *infra*, Nestor is seeking to comfort his despairing chief. Zeus, he says, may not vouchsafe success to Hector, if he makes a night assault. But if he does, Achilles is still in the camp. In Ξ Nestor and Agamemnon again meet. It is only a few hours after the conversation in K. Agamemnon is in a still lower depth of despair. The battle is now at the ships. He addresses Nestor first, and his words, Ξ 44-51, do read as if he were recalling Nestor's attempt to comfort him the night before. We might

paraphrase them thus. "I fear Hector *is* fulfilling his threat to burn the ships. And what profit to me if Achilles does relent? Others of the Achaeans are angry as he is, and reluctant to fight." The reference to both Hector and Achilles, as on the previous occasion, may of course be mere chance. It may, however, very well be otherwise. Ξ 49-51 are suspected, but on very poor grounds as stated by Dr. Leaf, *a.l.*

Again, the words put into Hector's mouth in Θ 521 f., are worth noticing,—φυλακὴ δέ τις ἔμπεδος ἔστω, μὴ λόχος εἰσέλθησι πόλιν λαῶν ἀπεόντων. In H 371=Σ 299, καὶ φυλακῆς μνήσασθε, κ.τ.λ., the order is in general terms. No specific reason is given. Why then in Θ? One cannot say that Hector fears that the enemy, in their battered state, would think of sending a force to the city, or could do so without being discovered. Is it then a foreshadowing of the Doloneia by the poet? That seems likely. It is noticeable that in regard to three other episodes in the poems which have been stigmatised as ungenuine, we have just such a premonitory hint as here. Mure (i. 262) takes Nestor's advice to Agamemnon in B 362 ff. as "a piece of poetical mechanism forming a transition to the ensuing muster-roll of the Greek host." And cf. Gemoll, *Der homerische Schiffskatalog*, 1. Similarly for ψ 138 f. in relation to the Laertes scene in the so-called "Continuation" of the *Odyssey*, and for X 416-22 as preparatory to Ω.

Again, one might almost urge that the poet of Z has the events of the Doloneia in his mind when he puts lines 227 f. into Diomede's mouth, "there are Trojans in plenty and *famous allies* for me to slaughter, whom, *Heaven helping me, I may pursue and overtake.*" And lastly, no one doubts that Diomede, in Ξ 112, is making a quiet retort. Twice during the previous night Nestor had referred to his youthfulness,—I 57 and K 176. He now recalls the small disparagement, just as in I 34 ff. he had paid back the insult Agamemnon had done him in Δ.

It is not suggested that all these items have the force of proof. But the incidents and references taken all together do seem to tend to diminish the isolation of the Doloneia.

## CHAPTER XVIII

### THE DOCTORING OF I

GROTE's strong opinion that K was composed for its present place has won very general acceptance. Dr. Leaf is one of a few who object. He says in his *Introduction* to K that it "cannot have been meant to follow on I. It is rather another case of a parallel rival to that book, coupled with it only in the final literary redaction." It was inserted by the postulated *Ordner*. The reasons for this conclusion are not understood. It seems to be against the evidence. But in his *Introduction* to I, Dr. Leaf gives his reasons for believing that the original opening of that book was expanded "in order to pave the way for K." And this expansion "seems clearly to belong to the final literary redaction." He is not singular in this view.

We take his reasons in order. In I we have an *Agora* followed by a *Boulé*, but the *Agora* "is called only, it would seem, for the glory of Nestor." Then once more we have one of the late blunderers, for only such an one could set out to glorify Nestor and end by covering Diomede with glory. Diomede is the hero of the occasion. The Achaeans, as usual, applaud him furiously, and even Nestor, who has another proposal to make, has to yield to the prevailing feeling and pay a warm compliment to his junior. But every scene in the *Iliad* in which Nestor takes part is questioned as due to the Neleid leanings of the Pisistratean editor. This time the Neleids were badly served. Next, the *Agora* is followed by the *Boulé*, "which should naturally precede it." The grounds should have been stated. We may admit that a *Boulé* did sometimes precede an *Agora*, but is there any reason to suppose that the *Agora* could not refer a matter to the *Boulé*? We know of none. See Jebb, 49 *n.*, approving Gladstone, *Studies*, iii. 98, and an account of the various

Assemblies in the poems by Seymour in *C.R.* xx. 338 f. It is clear there was variety of practice. Sometimes the *Agora* was not preceded by a *Boulé*. Nestor suggests, with a reservation of his object, that the *Boulé* shall meet, and line 79 shews that the suggestion was approved by the *Agora*. Again, "the only practical measure proposed is the placing of sentinels, which is needed as an introduction to the Doloneia, but has nothing to do with this book." The first reason seems to beg the question. The necessity for a guard can easily be understood, and Kornke, in a work to be mentioned presently, points out that there is nothing in I to suggest that it was a new precaution. On the contrary, the leaders of the φυλακτῆρες are spoken of as well known. I would compare 85 with II 168 ff. See also Wilamowitz, *Über das Θ. der Il.* 381. What is new on the occasion in I is, as Kornke points out, that the guard are, I 67, to bivouac outside the wall, evidently the better to watch the Trojans. Dr. Leaf's second reason is not very precise in its terms. It appears to mean that the placing of the sentinels was inappropriate. But it is surely forgotten that there had been a defeat of the Achaeans, their first in the open field, and that the Trojans were encamped on the plain in a position to strike during the night. And lastly, this expansion, which is not proved, is said "clearly" to belong to the final literary redaction. But there is no clearness on that point at all.

The *Agora* was summoned, as we know from the text, to consider Agamemnon's proposal that the army should take to the ships. Diomede settled that question amidst the plaudits of the host. Then Nestor intervenes. The army will remain. So far, so good; all have been saved from the disgrace of a retreat. But more was required than this. Diomede had not effected all that was necessary. *οὐ τέλος ἵκεο μύθων*, I 56. The position is full of peril, and there is but one resource. Achilles alone can save the situation. The operations in the field had been disastrous without him. He must be approached. Agamemnon must conciliate him. But Nestor refrains from mentioning this; he only says, in the *Agora*, that something more is necessary. Can we wonder? Was it a fit matter to be discussed before the assembled host? Agamemnon was unpopular already, and his position had not been improved by the disgraceful proposal he had made, and the sharp snub which

had been administered to him by Diomede. Even without this, was the delicate suggestion which Nestor had to make not one which could be better put and considered at a private meeting of the *γέροντες*? I cannot think that Dr. Leaf's conclusion has reason in it or any evidence to support it. Kornke has, in his pamphlet *Über den Eingang des neunten Gesanges der Ilias*, discussed the question in a very thorough manner with reference to all the difficulties that criticism has raised. He accepts K as late, and the reference in it to the guards as designed to connect it with I. But he finds no grounds whatever for suspecting any modification of the opening of the earlier book, and Rothe (*Jb.* 1898, 98) accepts the proof in its entirety. Kornke defends Nestor's suggestion for a *Boule* by the prudent old man's desire to "spare the Commander-in-chief the degradation" which the mention of his further proposal would entail. Cf. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* 380, and Robert, p. 496.

It would surely be strange if this tampering with I had been established,—strange that it should have taken such an extremely feeble form. We are asked to believe that it was done by the *Ordner*. In the exercise of his plenary powers he troubled himself about this trifling matter of the guards, and yet he left in the *Iliad* passages, such as Α 609 f. and ΙΙ 72, 85 f., which, in the eyes of Dissecting critics, are absolutely fatal to I. If the editor did not consider that these discrepancies—if they are as serious as modern critics think—ought to be cured, it is difficult to imagine inconsistencies which did require his attention, and impossible to understand how he came to give his sole attention to this one little point. It seems to be all past comprehension by the ordinary mind.

Wilamowitz, in his essay on Θ, takes quite a different view of the opening of I. He regards it and Θ and the conclusion of H as one *Eindichtung*, which was composed in order to bring I, or the remainder of it, and K, into the *Iliad*.

## CHAPTER XIX

### DRAMATIS PERSONAE

THE power of the hand that drew the Homeric characters has been the theme of unlimited praise. It is a faculty in which many consider the author of the poems,—for they cannot in this regard conceive a plurality of workers,—all but unrivalled. Some would not except Shakespeare. Even Dissectors pay their tribute; detraction is almost silent. And no less striking is the consistency throughout of the main features of the portraits, —*in primariis personis eadem lineamenta et ingeniorum et animorum* (Wolf, *Pref. to Il.*; cf. Mure, i. 231).<sup>1</sup> It should be a standing puzzle to those successors of Wolf who believe the poems grew through several centuries. There must have been wear and tear during a long tradition. We hardly require the experts to tell us that the saga is no constant quantity. If “expurgation” was an active influence, the changes must have been marked. A hero’s character would be overhauled; his own mother would soon have failed to recognise the reconstituted individual. *Sagenverschiebungen* again, if they took place on the scale alleged by the Dümmler-Bethe school, must have brought about great changes. Two Diomedes could be made into one, or one Aias might develop into two. But no change, no faltering is perceptible in Homer. All the portraits are consistent, masterly, and, as Father Browne puts it (*Handbook*, 320), clear-cut. Yet he is a follower of Geddes, whose duality almost postulates two schools of Homerids preserving and elaborating

<sup>1</sup> Wilamowitz will hardly command assent when he says (*Griech. u. lat. Literat. u. Sprache*, 10) that to talk of a “character” of the Homeric Achilles or Odysseus is foolishness. If so, Homeric

scholars must be “mostly fools.” To many the character of, say, Odysseus or Diomede, seems a sufficient reply to the Expansionists.

different views of different personages. And there was a point at which degeneration did set in. It is strange that it came *per saltum*, in the Cyclices. There is no degradation of Odysseus in Homer. But the Cyclices attributed to him and other heroes some of the meanest actions (Schmidt, *Ulix. posthom.* pt. i. 32). The hypothesis that best explains this perfect and sustained uniformity in the poems is that of one mind of high creative power, drawing the actors in the great dramas from large experience and with rare insight, so that they have become, more than the creations of any other master, types of humanity for all time,—forms “more real than living man, Nurslings of immortality.” It has been said that “the success of epic poetry depends on the author’s power of imagining and representing characters” (Ker, 17). It is one of the glories of the Homeric poems. Had these come into existence through an age-long process of accretion, we should have had what Professor Ker there describes, “stories, professing to be epic, in which there is no dramatic virtue, in which every new scene and new adventure merely goes to accumulate, in immortal verse, the proofs of the hero’s nullity and insignificance. This is not the epic poetry of the heroic ages.”

If it can be shewn that this consistency of presentation extends to the Doloneia, and that the chief actors in it are in act and temperament the men whom we know in other books, we shall be proving one more bond between our lay and these latter, and at the same time answering a number of objections. Not that there is a strong case to be met here. If we take Ranke’s careful essay, we find little that calls for an answer. He analyses the characters minutely (pp. 40-48), finds a wealth of traits common to K and the rest of the *Iliad*, but says they are copied. He does not prove this, and we can find no evidence of a strange hand slavishly tracing the lineaments of patterns constructed elsewhere. He also finds a debased ideal of the heroic in the Doloneia. But the incidents in the lay on which he builds are mostly slight. Only in respect of Diomede can his charge be regarded seriously. It is certain, even on Ranke’s own shewing, that if the *Heldentum* in the Doloneia is of a degenerate type, the falling off is small and scarcely perceptible.

Agamemnon in the Doloneia is just what the events of the

earlier books have made him. It is all admirably described by Mure (i. 314) and Lang (*H. and A.* chaps. iv. and v.). The picture is of a weak, impulsive man, unequal to his heavy responsibilities, with passions easily roused, and as easily overcome by apprehension, remorse or despair. He is jealous of his position and prerogatives, like any other early king of kings, but it needed a stronger man than Agamemnon to rule the "turbulent feudal society" which he was set over (Symonds, *Studs. in the Gk. Poets*, ii. 47; and van Gennep, *Quest.* 20). He quarrels with his vassals, and they openly express their contempt for him. Yielding, as he afterwards admits (I 119), to his evil temper, he even breaks with Achilles, the pride and stay of the camp. He regrets his folly and confesses at once, B 378. But he struggles on, now groaning over his sin and its fruit,—οὐ δύνατο λελαθέσθ’ ἄτης, γὰρ πρῶτον ἀάσθη, T 136,—now shewing a bold front and even repeating his folly by insulting his captains on the field of battle,—till the will of Zeus begins to work. One "dolorous day" of reverse in the field, and his weak spirit gives in entirely. The enterprise must be abandoned. Anything to get rid of the load that is crushing him. This is in I. Yet Kuhlbars can say (p. 8) that outside K Agamemnon never *se praebet ab omni spe destitutum*. He forgets Μ 74 ff. as well as I.

Agamemnon is saved from this supreme disgrace by Diomede and Nestor, and we see how low he has fallen when he is told in open *Agora* that he is coward as well as fool, I 32, 39, and has no word to say in reply. He eagerly catches at the proposal to conciliate Achilles, and makes a great parade of the reparation he is ready to make. But withal we feel there is unreality, un genuineness about it (Harder, *Homer*, 256). "He sets about it like a tradesman" (Grimm, 22), and we are not surprised that he does not succeed. There is a broken, but not a really contrite spirit. And when his envoys return and report their failure, the cup is full for Agamemnon. He is forsaken by God and man. In the hour of his *ὕβρις* he had boasted of the patronage of Heaven; now Achilles, and even Hector had supplanted him (B 110 f., Θ 236 ff., I 17 ff., 116 f., K 45 f. and 70 f.). His followers are mutinous (B 222 f., N 107 ff., Μ 49 ff., 132, and cf. Leaf on T 85 and Allen in *C.R.* xxi. 19). It was doubtful once, B 72-83, if they could be got to face the Trojans (*Jb.* 1903, 286). This is the plight of Agamemnon at the opening

of K. He can never know peace again while he lives (K 89 f.). Escape from his troubles is denied him. He must stay and suffer, and the worst may yet be to come.

All this seems plain and well vouched. Yet difficulties are made. The critics comment on Agamemnon's charge to his brother in 67 ff. He is thinking of the antagonism which his arrogant behaviour has aroused. Zeus is punishing him. Read, in 71, *γεινομένοισιν* with nearly all the best editors. "It is because we have been guilty of such folly that Zeus hath afflicted us."

Again, in 57 f. the poet of K represents Agamemnon as saying Nestor will have more influence with the guards than he, the Commander-in-chief. Fick finds this "too absurd."<sup>1</sup> It is not, if we remember the disaffection in the camp. The special confidence expressed in Nestor's son and Idomeneus' squire, two of the captains of the guard, is significant. Nestor had always been Agamemnon's friend. That Idomeneus was in the same position of active confidence we infer from the *Epipōlēsis*. Again, in that scene Aias is paid a compliment for his loyalty, and it is Aias and Idomeneus who are the first, after Nestor, to be thought of on the night of the Doloneia. All consists with what we find in the other books of the *Iliad*.

The most natural step of all, the visit to the guards, is one of the greatest stumbling-blocks. The critics make merry over 19 f. and 43. They seem to expect a regular council and a formal scheme. What Agamemnon wants must surely be judged from what he says and does. Things are in a parlous state. Hector, he goes on to tell Menelaus, is irresistible. If he renews the attack by night, all is lost,—46 ff., 93 and 100 f. It was an ordinary precaution to see that the sentinels were on the alert. And they were. They understood what they had been posted for, 188 f. At the fosse there is deliberation and further measures are taken. See p. 2 *supra*. A blow was dealt at Hector that sufficiently spoiled the victory he had gained during the day. The poet, telling his story in his own way, makes a really good one. It does not please the critics, but it was not made for them.

It is also objected that the picture of Agamemnon's distress

<sup>1</sup> On p. 388 of his *Iliad* he says it is an "Ionic" touch. We have the Neleids again.

is overdone. To us moderns it may appear to more than meet the case. But it is quite in keeping with the rest of the *Iliad*. The Achaean heroes' ways were not as our ways. *Ils expriment leur douleur et leur joie avec une violence toute primitive, toute orientale même* (Bougot, 197; cf. Blume, *Ideal*, 15). We might refer to other manifestations of anguish, even to the disfigurement of the face, which are described in the poems. It is enough to mention Priam, Andromaché, Briseïs, and Achilles himself. Parallels are plentiful in other poetry. Rustam, like Agamemnon, plucks his hair out by the roots. The ladies of Iran tear their faces and necks. Shakespeare often paints exhibitions of distress in the very strongest colours. In the Doloneia there is no greater excess. The emotions of Southern and Eastern peoples find vent more easily than those of Northern Europe. Achilles in Σ. 23 f., "casts dust upon his golden head"; a man in India will force a handful into his mouth. In K the poet is describing a weak chief in the extremity of remorse and despair. The curse Achilles had laid on Agamemnon, σὺ δ' ἔνδοθι θυμὸν ἀμύξεις, A 240 ff., is fulfilled to the letter in K, just as in I we have the fulfilment of Athéné's promise, τρὶς τόσσα παρέσσεται ἀγλαὰ δῶρα, A 213. In early poetry written for men of an early day, we do not expect that such a curse and such a promise shall remain of no effect.

Diomede is a hero for whom, as already mentioned, a double origin has been found. But if there were two embryos, it is certain that the matured character is one in the *Iliad*. And if a host of poets laboured to make up the picture there presented to us, the unanimity with which they wrought is certainly remarkable. Diomede is a knight *sans peur*. In the Doloneia he is in pointed contrast to his terror-stricken chief. In the fight during the day he had stood his ground, when others fled before the portents of Heaven. That he was the one to answer Nestor's call at the fosse, is consistent with his character elsewhere as the heartener of his fellows, and the determined opponent of any compromise with the enemy or weakness in the face of disaster (H 400 f., I 45 ff., and Ξ 128 ff.). He is young, but his prowess in the field and his sturdy good sense in council<sup>1</sup> *supplent aetatem*. There is an old head on good young shoulders. Even hostile criticism helps us here. Dr. Leaf, on I 31, notes the "moderation"

<sup>1</sup> βουλῆ μετὰ πάντας ὁμήλικας ἐπλευ ἀριστος, I 54.

of the hero, and quotes K 219 as well as H 399 and I 696. And cf. Mure, i. 322 f. "A dilemma, a pause, a silence"; Diomede comes forward, and confidence is restored. His good qualities evoke a compliment from Nestor in I 53 ff. But the old counsellor, who never forgets the advisory prerogative which his own age and experience confer, cannot help referring with a slight air of patronage to Diomede's youth. Just so in K 176,—Nestor again. Next day, in Η 111 f., Diomede reminds his hearers, among whom is Nestor, of these remarks.

Diomede's attitude to Agamemnon in K is also consistent. In Δ 370 ff. he takes in silence the affront put upon him by his overlord, and represses Sthenelus. As Mr. Lang puts it, "he bides his time," which comes in I. In K, in the same way, he has no special respect for the great but weak man. When the latter addresses him, 234 ff., in the most winning way, he takes no notice. He answers Agamemnon's question, but addresses himself to the company generally. Odysseus had also suffered from Agamemnon's temper in the *Epipōlēsis*. In 249 the man of many wiles may be making quiet allusion to that foolish outburst.

There remains the one departure from the heroic ideal noted by Ranke, the killing of Dolon and the slaughter of the sleeping Thracians. But the heroic ideal can be, and often is, rated too high. When the heroes' ways are set before us, as by Blume, nothing extenuating, we see that Homer does not make them perfect (Mure, i. 394). They are most of them, to use a common saying, as their mothers bore them; some of them a good deal worse. "They are heroes, and first-rate ones; but they are the heroes of the oldest paganism" (Coleridge, *Greek Classic Poets*,<sup>2</sup> 183; cf. van Gennep, *Quest.* 37). The brutality that Agamemnon was capable of is marked in A 31. There is nothing that is knightly in his words in Z 57 ff. or A 113 ff., or even in Nestor's in B 355. The "gentle" Patroclus can jeer at a fallen foe, or long to secure his corpse to disfigure it, Π 745 ff., 559. The Homeric hero hates his enemy. He sees *in dem Gegner immer nur den Feind* (Blume, 31; Finsler, 351). He may take him and hold him to ransom, or he may kill him and disfigure his corpse and fling it to the dogs. He may hurl his child from the walls, or even slay it in its mother's womb. His wife he reserves for the worst form of slavery. To his foeman "the Greek hero

is ruthless" (Blume, 33). He may spare him, if the mood be on him, but in killing him where and when he finds him, he is guilty of no *ὕβρις* in the sight of god or man. He is "not a good Christian like the critics" (Mülder, *Quellen*, 172).

For Dolon, a spy has never had gentle treatment in the warfare of any age. Diomede says plainly that a man who was capable, in his own conceit at least, of penetrating the Achaean lines and gaining information, was better out of the way. As to the Thracians, the poet wanted the horses brought out. After Hector's insolent reference to the horses of Achilles, the Thracian steeds had to be secured, and the heroes could not take the sleepers prisoners. It is a case of those "necessities of the moment" which Rothe and others mark in the poems, but which are spurned by interpreters who seek for discrepancies. That Diomede nowhere else perpetrates such a deed is not to the point. It should be shewn that in similar circumstances he was wont to display a merciful chivalrousness. We cannot be required to produce a parallel for every incident in a lay. Telemachus is of an extremely gentle nature. But on one occasion, χ 461-77, he superintends and apparently takes part in a work of savagery, on the maids of Odysseus and on Melanthios, with which nothing else in Homer can be compared. Ranke would say the faithless thralls deserved to die. Diomede might answer that one's enemies "are always in the wrong," especially when they stand in a man's way who is, as Grimm puts it, "greedy for booty" and in a mood to achieve something *κύντατον* (K 503 and Grimm, 44 ff.). But grant that in this matter there is a departure from the Homeric ideal. It is the only one, and it is neither "so deep as a well, nor so wide as a church door." A similar action in the *Aeneid* would not attract attention, at least it would not be argued that it is the work of a later poet in days of a lower ideal. Heinze (p. 216) defends the massacre (*Blutbad*) in the Nisus-Euryalus episode. But it does not appear that *any* excuse can be pleaded for it. See also Plüss in *Jahrb. k. Ph.* 1888, 187.

To most people the delineation of the Homeric Nestor is perfect,—a *Hauptstück homerischer Kunst*. Maginn (*Hom. Ballads*, 57) thinks one can test a critic's appreciation of the epic by his attitude towards the old chief. The Pylian king is *magna pars* of the *Iliad*. Yet Dissectors would expel him

as the creation of Ionian Neleids on hints from an imagined "Pylian Epos." We can once more only marvel at the perfect whole which the interpolators have bequeathed to us.

As military adviser-in-chief, Nestor is naturally to the front in a canto which describes the Achaean fortunes at their nadir. He is prominent in I, and we meet him again in Ξ, hurrying to his chief when he sees that the sacred scales of Zeus are once more inclined to the Trojan side. But in the Doloneia Kuhlbars thinks he talks "much nonsense," and Jahr misses "the sweetness and wisdom of his discourse." We protest against expecting an old man roused from his sleep after an extremely trying day to be at his best as a talker. But if we had space to analyse his speeches in K, it would be easy, we think, to shew that there are method and sense in his every word. Take the remark which is specially fastened on, his reference to Achilles in 105 ff. (Leaf, *Introdn.* to K; Kuhlbars, 9; Düntzer, 307; and Naber, 170). Nestor never forgets the unfortunate breach. He strives to stop the quarrel in A, he insists on atonement in I, and in Λ he appeals to Patroclus. It would not be strange, then, that he should regret with a sigh, intending the effect on Agamemnon, that the host could not have an hour of Achilles to wreck the triumph of Hector. But there is more than this. The words *καὶ πλείοσιν* seem important, and I believe the critics err in one particular. It is ridiculous, they say, to talk of Achilles relenting, when he has just shewn that nothing will move him. But there *was* a point at which he would forget his grievance,—when Hector should reach *his* hut and ship (I 654 f.). Now Agamemnon is in dread of a night attack. Nestor has to comfort him. He tells his chief he takes too gloomy a view. Let Hector come on. He had better not be too sure of Zeus. We will give him a fight. And if the worst comes to the worst, Achilles is still at his ships, and "all's right with the" camp. Hector may succeed at first, but only to find himself involved in greater trouble—*κῆδεσι μοχθήσειν καὶ πλείοσιν*—if he reaches the Myrmidon lines. That seems a reasonable interpretation of the passage.—Since writing it I see, from a brief reference in Mure's Epitome of K (vol. i. 245), that he appears to take the same view.

The other great difficulty is that, as soon as Nestor appears, Agamemnon retires to the background. That is so, and it is

quite natural in the circumstances. Agamemnon is in a state of abject terror, and unfit to act. Nestor sees his condition, administers some comfort, and sets to work. He *is* in charge all the time, and Agamemnon is nowhere,—except at one point. Agamemnon interposes to prevent Menelaus from being chosen by Diomede. That is quite in consonance with his character,—“undeniably Homeric” (Nitsche). See Δ 148-91 and H 107 ff. But it has given offence, and K 240, in which the poet explains, must be cut out. All is consistent till the critics come and spoil it.

Menelaus himself plays a minor part in the lay. We notice some points in the references to him, p. 173 *infra*.

On the Trojan side, Hector is the one chief mentioned in the Doloneia as an active agent, and, except for one short scene, only incidentally. Yet we find some small touches which recall similar indications in other parts of the *Iliad*. His deeds that the Argives are to remember for many a day, are dwelt on in K 47 ff., as in Λ 502, X 380, and elsewhere. His offer of Achilles’ horses, K 305 f., is on a par with the inducement he parades for the man who shall recover the body of Patroclus, P 231. Again, it is not infrequently suggested that Hector’s valour entitles him to rank with heroes of divine parentage. Much the same idea is found in K 47-50, which Dr. Leaf, on Ω 258, quotes in illustration of Priam’s pride in his dead son. Cf. the expressions in N 54, 825, and Θ 538 ff.

Dolon, like Rhēsus, does not reappear, so we have no opportunity of comparing his behaviour in K with his character elsewhere. The poet’s reflection in 336 f., when he is rushing to his death, may be compared with that in M 113-15 on Asios, another “rash, intruding” warrior on the Trojan side who ventured overmuch, though it was not, as in Dolon’s case, covetousness, but the thirst for glory that led him to his death. *ἀγηνορίη δέ μιν ἔκτα.*

The description of Dolon has been much admired for the amount of the information about the new-comer condensed by the poet into two or three brief but telling sentences. See Platt’s *By-ways in the Classics*, 75, quoting Morley’s *Life of Gladstone*, iii. 388. Dolon is “a bad fellow, whose badness Homer explains by the fact that he was a brother brought up among sisters only”: *αὐτὰρ ὁ μοῦνος ἦν μετὰ πέντε*

*καστιγνήτησιν.*<sup>1</sup> This line, K 317, describes a state of things in a family circle the converse of which is found several times elsewhere,—Andromaché and her seven brothers, Briseïs and her three, Nausikaa and her five. Cf. Ω 399 of Hermes-Polyctorides. Such touches may well be an idiosyncrasy of a poet in an early age, when a man might repeat himself freely, originality not being the prime requirement which it is in modern times.

The two divine agents who are named in K hardly require mention. They are the Athené and Apollo whom we know well in the *Iliad*. But objection has been made to their appearing in the Doloneia at all. Principal Geddes (*Problem*, 41 n.) finds “one of the difficulties attending K as it now stands” in the interference of Apollo and Athené “after the great interdict by Zeus” in Θ. So Christ, *Iliad*, 40, and cf. Friedländer, *Hom. Kritik*, 68 and n., and others. We assume that the objection cannot be seriously meant to apply to the heron sent by Athené in 274, or to the description, by common formulae, in 366 and 482, of the will with which Diomede sets himself to spear at Dolon and slaughter the Thracians. If we refer to the poet himself, we find that in 462 he conceives the goddess as in Olympus. She may be said, if we are to interpret very literally, to be on the scene in 508, when she advises Diomede to get away. But Hermann's *Minerva Ulixem salvum reducit* (*De Interpol. Hom.* 13) goes too far. In Mure's judgment (i. 257 n.) Hermann is hypercritical. It was only “direct combative participation in the conflict” that Zeus forbade. Athené in K is faithful to her promise in Θ 35 f. To give advice “was always lawful to all” (Naber, 17, and cf. Lindner, *Das Eingreifen der Götter in d. Handlung d. Il.* 24, and Hammer, *Qualem Minervam finixerit Hom.* 23). Apollo's action in rousing Hippokoön, 518, was no transgression of Zeus' prohibition Τρώεσσιν ἀρηγέμεν. Ranke admits that (p. 24). But the whole discussion is unsound. “The prohibition does not make disobedience impossible” (Friedländer, *Hom. Krit.* 31 n.). Zeus might issue commands if he chose. The poet could make deities obey or not as he chose. He pulls the divine strings. Every turn in the story brings fresh needs. Sometimes it is with him

<sup>1</sup> The biographer continues: “Oliver Cromwell, by the way, was an only surviving boy among seven sisters, so we cannot take either poet or surgeon for gospel.” The surgeon, John Hunter, had confirmed Homer from his own observation.

$\pi\hat{\alpha}n \ddot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\sigma\omega\nu$ ; the gods can work at a distance. At others, they are subject to limitations, even as men are. We need hardly discuss the genuineness of Θ 28-40 till some better motive for interpolation is given. The popular one (Leaf, *a.l.*) is, that the lines were inserted to explain the "moral support" given in subsequent books by Athené and other deities. But permission for "moral support" is just what Athené claimed and Zeus granted.<sup>1</sup> An interpolator who detected more in the divine interventions in Θ, K, Λ, O and P, and thought it necessary to remove inconsistency, must surely have been a very stickler for harmony. See Bäumlein, *Commentat.* 30, and Terret, 222 ff. And how these small inconsistencies were detected and cured, while others remain so great and glaring that critics can use them to shatter the scheme of the *Iliad*, is one of the many mysteries of its own creation which the Higher Criticism does not attempt to probe.

It has also been suggested by Erhardt (*op. cit.* 164 ff.; cf. Cauer, *Grundfrgn.* 133) that it is to Athenian influence that the part played by Athené in K is due. But Unitarians still ask in vain for tangible and sufficient evidence of Athenian manipulation of the poems. No one will go so far as to say that the Athené of Homer is the creation of Athenian diaskeuasts or the Pisistratean Commission. The case must rest on the scanty references to Menestheus and Theseus,<sup>2</sup> and one or two other small indications. Interpolators were an *absurda natio*; we know that from their patrons, or creators, the Dissectors of the poems. But surely those who worked in the Athenian interest were the weakest of all. The praise of Menestheus in B is balanced by the abuse levelled at him in Δ. What sort of doctoring was it that allowed such an insult to Athens to stand? If, as Erhardt suggests (*l.c.*), the Athenians gave K its final shape in the sixth century, is it conceivable that, with such a chance and with, no doubt, all the will in the world, they restricted their part in the *Iliad* to such modest dimensions? See Mure, ii. 209 f.; Geddes, *Problem*, 302 ff.; Paley on B 548; and Allen in

<sup>1</sup> If, in this much debated passage, we accept the well-vouched reading, *εἰ* *σὺ κελεύεις*, in line 35, and translate "if you really insist on it," Zeus' reply presents no difficulty.

<sup>2</sup> Even A 265 is defended by P. Friedländer, *Herakles*, 167 and *n.*—See

now, on such passages, Mr. Snow in *C.R.* xxiv. 185. His opinion is that the Athenians were able to do so little, because they were "working on a fixed and finished text, which they could not venture to expand perceptibly." But M 331-77 is not trifling.

*C.Q.* iii. 84, 87.—It is the same, we may add, with the “Rhodian interpolation” in B. It was, we are told, inserted to the glory of Rhodes in the days of her maritime supremacy. She is glorified with *nine* ships, the smallest of all the contingents save only those of Philoctetes and Nireus. The interpolator might at least have written *νῆας πεντήκοντ'* ἄγαγεν ‘Ροδίων ἀγερώχων in B 654. But an interpolator seldom manages to give satisfaction.

## CHAPTER XX

### ODYSSEUS

ODYSSEUS is the Homeric hero whom we know best. He fills by far the largest space on the canvas of the two epics. But apart from that, his character appeals to us as one more general, more everyday and more modern in its attributes than the others. We know Achilles well too. In the last six books of the *Iliad* the poet hardly allows the reader's eye to stray from him. But he is still a saga figure, as becomes the son of a goddess, to whom but a few years of glorious life on earth have been allotted. His passions are more than human. In his rage only the destruction of the whole Achaean and Trojan hosts together will satisfy him. See Robert, 356. The motives that sway him are a terror even to the Higher Criticism, which has stumbled sorely in its efforts to unravel them. It is far different with Odysseus.<sup>1</sup> He offers no problems; analysis is not required. He is very man, reflecting characteristics, as was said of the poem that bears his name, as common  $\epsilon\nu\tau\varphi\acute{\alpha}v\theta\rho\omega\pi\iota\nu\varphi\beta\iota\omega$  in the heroic age as they are now and as they have always been. So he was not an ethical model, but we must not judge him by modern standards. He had "a ready turn for dissimulation" (Mure, i. 392); but cunning, even of what seems to us a low type, was not matter of reprobation in heroic days. He may have been deceiving Dolon in K 383. Orszulik (p. 6) thinks he was, and seems to think no worse of him. Certainly he did not interpose later to prevent Diomede from cutting Dolon down. But we cannot be sure that he lied. There is nothing mean proved against him in Homer. A debased conception of his character became popular in days of

<sup>1</sup> "If Odusseus was what the Greeks admired, and were, Achilles was what they wondered at" (Blakeney, *Transln.* of *Il.* 229 n.).

epic decadence and persisted for ages after. The *convicia* of the Greek tragedians are collected by Schmidt (*Ulix. posthom.* 83 f.). A goodly collection might be made from the *Aeneid*. Odysseus has become a monster of meanness. But this view of the hero did not avail to oust the splendid original of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, "the definitive and final portrait made by a single master-hand" (Mr. T. A. Cook in *Fortnightly Rev.* lxxxii. 925; and see Robert, 360).

In the epics Odysseus is presented to us, in battle as a warrior of the first rank, and in all the works of peace sagacious, skilled, and resourceful above his fellows. He is prominent in every enterprise, *βουλάς τ' ἐξάρχων ἀγαθὰς πόλεμόν τε κορύσσων*. It was from the epics that Horace drew when he wrote *quid virtus et quid sapientia possit, Utile proposuit nobis exemplar Ulixen*. His valour and intrepidity in the face of danger he shares with others; his practical wisdom, his wide experience of men and manners, and his capacity for all the business of life are his own. He crowns his achievements by the capture of Troy. He never fails. *παντοπόρος, ἄπορος ἐπ'* οὐδὲν ἔρχεται. In all the practical work of life he has no rival (Gladstone, *Primer*, 148). Nestor, by age and experience, has the special position of military adviser to the force, and is admittedly past his best. Odysseus "stands to him as *πρακτικός*" (Schmid, *Hom. Stud.* ii. 33).

The delineation in the poems of this master mind is, by almost universal consent, consistent throughout. He is certainly not one of those characters whom Father Browne (p. 113) describes as "fiercer and more elemental" in the Achilleid. The presentation of Odysseus is dwelt on with enthusiasm by writers who have given us studies of the Homeric *dramatis personae*, as Mure, Gladstone, Hayman and Lang. The last named regards him as the hero of the *Iliad*, the man the poet admires most (*Anthropol. and Class.* 60 f.). The authors of special monographs on the hero, as Kretschmar and Marcowitz, find no weakening anywhere. Even the enemies of the Doloneia may be said, for all their seeking, to find no ground for charging its author with failure to appreciate Odysseus. Nitsche and Orszulik and Harder (*Homer*, 234) admit that he is, like the other heroes who come on the stage in our lay, his own self and no other. Ranke can make up his mind to no serious complaint. In Kuhlbars' running

commentary there is hardly an unfavourable word. Odysseus is at his best in the Doloneia, which is often referred to as his *Aristeia* in the *Iliad*. His is the head that directs the enterprise throughout, and carries it, as we expect from what we know of him elsewhere, to a successful issue. We need not wonder that there is a lay in the *Iliad* devoted to him and his comrade Diomede.

Two serious attempts have been made to "slice" the Odysseus of the poems, by Geppert (*Ursprung*, i. 293 ff.) and by Geddes.<sup>1</sup> To the former the hero is a warrior in the *Iliad*, in the *Odyssey* a man of the world. But who will say that Odysseus lacks courage in the *Odyssey*, or resource and address in the *Iliad*? Again in the *Iliad* he is a big man, and likened, Γ 196 ff., to a great ram leading the flock, "towering above all in size and strength"; in the *Odyssey* he is jeered at by Polyphemus as a puny object, and requires Athéné's help at every turn to give him imposing stature. This seems quite wrong. Agamemnon was taller than Odysseus by a head, and there were men in the host taller by a head than Agamemnon, Γ 193 and 168. Once more, Geppert, calculating carefully, finds Odysseus must have been sixty when Calypso was so loth to lose him, and too elderly a beau, even if we bear in mind the scholiast's δεινὸν τὸ ἡρωϊκόν. We may safely disregard this consideration.

Principal Geddes exposes in the poems two views of the hero's character, too widely different attitudes towards it. The author of the Achilleid is "dubiously, if not coldly, indifferent" to Odysseus. In the Ulyssean area there is "a special vein of admiration" for him (*Problem*, 81, 97). The method of discrimination will not, however, bear examination. The Ulyssean area is far larger than the Achilleid, and gives proportionately more scope for Odysseus; while his opportunities in the Achilleid, after three of its fourteen books are passed, are reduced almost to nil. He is wounded and has to retire, and when he reappears, Achilles is all in all to the poet, and Odysseus, like others, in four of the five last books, Σ, Τ, Φ, and Χ, sinks into temporary obscurity. In fact he comes on the scene but twice, but in each

<sup>1</sup> The efforts of Dissectors of the *Odyssey* to find different representations of Odysseus in that poem have not been successful. One of the latest attempts is by Fick (*Entstg. d. Od.* 93). In the

*Tisis* Odysseus is a "homesick sufferer"; in the *Nostos* a "cunning lying knave." But surely even a rogue may long for his home.

case only the most hardened opposition to his claims could characterise the part he plays as other than most creditable. And in the whole of the *Iliad* there are but three passages from which anything unfavourable to the hero can be extracted, in Α, Δ, and Θ. It can be shewn, we think, that not one of them supports the theory of Geddes. He finds disparagement of Odysseus in Α, which is Achilleid. We find the exact reverse. In Δ, which is "Ulyssean," and where therefore Odysseus should be tenderly and admiringly treated, our hero is vilified by Agamemnon. As to Θ, if we grant to Geddes that Odysseus is a coward in that book, there are few in these days of advanced Dissection who will agree with him that Θ is of the Achilleid. It is said to be one of the very late books, and it *ought* to be Odyssean (p. 129 *supra*). Father Browne, who is a follower of Geddes, says it is.

Geddes' treatment of the incident in Α seems to disclose a very ecstasy of partiality. We must read the passage with his comments (*op. cit.* 95 f.). Odysseus, wounded and surrounded by Trojans, has "difficulty in screwing his courage up," and though at one point he "is compared honourably enough to a κάπριος . . . , and proves a very πῆμα or 'Tartar' to the Trojans," he is afterwards "likened to an ἔλαφος or 'stag,'—not the most warlike of animals,"—though it is a stag at bay,—“and screams” —ηύσεν—“with all his might thrice,”—“as loud as the head of the wight<sup>1</sup> could bawl.” But Odysseus is not compared to a stag, any more than he is compared to a squid in ε 432 ff., or to a haggis in ν 25 ff., or Aias to an ass in Α 558 ff. (Finsler, 498). As happens so often, the Homeric practice in regard to the *tertium comparationis* is neglected. The surrounding of Odysseus is compared to the surrounding of a wounded stag by jackals. That is all. And how different the appreciations by other authorities. Hayman (*Odyssey*, vol. i. App. E, lviii.) describes the scene as “in itself an *Odyssey* in little; there is no more gallant picture in the poem.” Professor Ker asks (p. 9), “by what magic is it that the cry of Odysseus wounded and hard bestead in his retreat before the Trojans, comes over us like the three blasts of the horn of Roland?” He does not regard it as the “scream” of a coward. Robert, 105, and cf. 360, refers to the incident as an *Aristeia* of Odysseus. If there be

<sup>1</sup> Geddes admits that this is not a certain rendering of φωτός. We would rather compare Tennyson's “but at the flash and motion of the man.”

“depression” here, there is not much in the way of “doughty deeds” left for us to admire in the epics. Even Achilles himself is not honoured by the ascription of any such feat of arms. But Father Browne (p. 116), following Geddes, thinks Odysseus’ “conduct appears almost ignoble.”

The second passage is in the *Epipōlēsis*. There Odysseus is addressed by Agamemnon in the quite extraordinary line, Δ 339, *καὶ σύ, κακοῖσι δόλοισι κεκασμένε, κερδαλεόφρον,* and is charged with cowardice and with a better liking for the feasts of the *γέροντες* than for the *πολέμου ὀαριστύς*. Geddes explains away. These are “certain words of censure” (*op. cit.* 86 f.). They are abuse, pure and simple. To appreciate their true import, one has only to turn to a very similar line, A 149, uttered by Achilles in his wrath. The poet of the “Ulyssean area,” if imbued with admiration for his hero, should have omitted the scene or toned down this public rating from the head of the army.

All that can be said against Odysseus in Θ is said by Geddes (*op. cit.* 93 f.); and many other authorities, as Ranke (p. 25), Bergk (p. 588), and Kayser (*H.A.* 85), make it ground of objection to K, that Diomede should choose Odysseus as his comrade, after the cowardice shewn by the latter a few hours before,—Θ 92 ff. Much depends on the point whether *ἐσάκουσε*, Θ 97, means that Odysseus “did not heed” Diomede’s appeal for help, or “did not hear” it. Dr. Leaf and Paley, *a.l.*, and Mr. Platt (*J. Phil.* xviii. 131) accept the latter. If that be correct, there is nothing more to be said. But even on the other interpretation, many find nothing against Odysseus. See, for example, Hayman, *l.c.*; Lauer, *Gesch. d. hom. Poes.* 262 f.; and Calebow, *Il. lib. oct.* 64 f. Calebow says of the passages in K and Θ, *optime congruunt*. In both Diomede picks out Odysseus. The words *κακὸς ὡς*, Θ 94, are said, “not in vilification, but in exhortation.”

Consider the circumstances. Zeus was free with his bolts that day. At his first cast the Greek chiefs turn and flee. Diomede remains; Odysseus goes with the rest. But we remember that he fought *πεζός*. Diomede had a car and a splendid team, E 222 f.=Θ 106 f. But after Zeus’ second bolt, Diomede retires too, the Trojans under Hector pursuing him and pelting him with missiles and abuse. He was one degree better than Odysseus, and Odysseus was no whit worse

than the others. But take him at the worst the critics can say of him. Even so, there was, as Ranke admits, nothing to affect the qualities of discretion and resourcefulness for which Diomede expressly extols and selects him in K. We recognise no difficulty. We need not even go so far as to admit with some that "every man has his moments of weakness." We have not an exhibition of weakness here. Rather we should say, with Mure, that Odysseus recognised that there was against the Achaean host that day "the arm of God,"— $\delta\sigma\tau\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\kappa\mu\mu\sigma\alpha\lambda\delta\rho\alpha\phi\beta\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\lambda\dot{\alpha}\phi\beta\dot{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\tau\theta\iota\kappa\eta\eta\dot{\rho}\eta\dot{\iota}\delta\omega\sigma$ . It has also been pointed out that Odysseus did not return to the fight with the rest in the rally of Θ 253 ff. He is not *named* as returning, and a possible explanation lies on the surface. Compare Θ 262-5 with H 164-7. The poet is repeating himself. After Θ 265 (= H 167) we expect, as in H 168, mention of Thoas and Odysseus. But the  $\dot{\alpha}\nu\delta\acute{e}$  of the latter line does not suit, and the poet starts off on the *Aristeia* of Teucer.

The Odysseus of the poems is one, and in K he is as in the other books. But there is one point on which Odyssean connection has been argued with evil intent to the Doloneia. See, e.g., Niese, *Entwickelung*, 65. The hero is called  $\tau\lambda\dot{\eta}\mu\omega\sigma$  in 231 and 498, and nowhere else in Homer. Many critics translate "patient," "enduring"; and as  $\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma\dot{i}\phi\omega\sigma$  and  $\pi\omega\lambda\dot{u}\tau\lambda\alpha\sigma$ , which are frequent in the *Odyssey*, are said to have the same meaning,  $\tau\lambda\dot{\eta}\mu\omega\sigma$  is supposed to indicate Odyssean affinity. But for  $\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma\dot{i}\phi\omega\sigma$  (and its by-form,  $\tau\alpha\lambda\dot{a}\phi\omega\sigma$ ) Ebel. gives *fortis* as well as *patiens*,—see N 300 and Δ 421,—and for  $\pi\omega\lambda\dot{u}\tau\lambda\alpha\sigma$  *impavidus* as one meaning. See also Bäumlein, *Commentat.* 13 n. For  $\tau\lambda\dot{\eta}\mu\omega\sigma$ , Dr. Leaf (on K 231) gives "enduring" in all its occurrences,—in K, in E 670 ( $\tau\lambda\dot{\eta}\mu\omega\sigma\theta\mu\dot{\omega}\nu\dot{\chi}\omega\sigma$ , of Odysseus, and good support for K), and Φ 430,  $\theta\alpha\tau\sigma\alpha\lambda\acute{e}\sigma\iota\kappa\tau\lambda\dot{\eta}\mu\omega\sigma\nu\sigma$  (Pierron, *courageux*, which  $\theta\alpha\tau\sigma\alpha\lambda\acute{e}\sigma\iota$  seems to justify; L. and S. "bold"). Bréal (*Pour mieux*, 297) translates *courageux* in K 231, and the addition in 232 seems to make the meaning certain. See Hayman, vol. i. App. Ix. In 498 Pierron gives *audacieux*; Kreutz (*De different. orationis Hom.*, etc., 20),  $\epsilon\dot{\nu}\tau\omega\lambda\mu\sigma$ .  $\pi\omega\lambda\dot{u}\tau\lambda\dot{\eta}\mu\omega\sigma$  may also be cited. In σ 319 it is certainly *valde patiens*. But in H 152 was it Nestor's "much-enduring" or "greatly daring" spirit that moved him to accept Ereuthalion's challenge? The critics seem to be

wrong. The “patient, steadfast, stout-hearted” of L. and S. gives the order of evolution in the meaning of the word. In K it is used of the “utter hardihood” of Odysseus.

That *τλήμων* is used only twice of Odysseus is of no importance. A solitary occurrence of one of a number of epithets of a person or thing is not uncommon. In K, I believe we have only metrical convenience. In 231 the word had to come after *ἡθελε δέ*. Of all the many epithets of the hero only *ἀντίθεος*, with the final syllable long in *arsi*, would have suited. The recurrence of *τλήμων* in 498, after it had been once used, is intelligible enough. But one epithet can prove little. Take all that are applied to Odysseus. He has, excluding his patronymic, 12 in K. Of these 9 are common to K and the rest of the poems, and 3, *διφύλος*, *Διὺς μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος*, and *τλήμων*, are found outside K only in the *Iliad*. No epithet is found only in K and the *Odyssey*. And there are some 12 applied to Odysseus in the *Odyssey* which are not used in K. So the Odyssean stigma again vanishes on examination.

One other point may be noticed. A passage in K seems to point to a connection of Odysseus with Crete which is traceable in other parts of the poems. It is Meriones the Cretan who lends him, for the expedition, a casque which had originally been in the possession of Odysseus’ grandfather, and a bow. That Meriones was a Bowman we know from N and Ψ, and that Odysseus was expert in archery while *δήμῳ ἔνι Τρώων*, we know from θ 220, though we may be pardoned for observing that (θ 221 and 229) it seems to have been a very long bow that he drew at the court of Alcinous. This loan of a bow by a man from Crete consists with the rest of the poems. But it has been made ground for asserting a difference between the Odysseus of the *Iliad* and the Odysseus of the *Odyssey*.

Dr. Monro (*Odyssey*, 305) says archery was looked on with contempt in the *Iliad*, but this is an idea which seems to be overdone. It is mainly due to Diomedes’ abuse of Paris in Λ 385. *ἰόμωροι* in Δ 242 and Ξ 479 proves nothing, as its meaning is unknown. Some, perhaps the majority, favour the derivation from *iόs*, others do not. N 713 is also quoted, but see 718. Teucer, a warrior of nearly first rank, not to mention Philoctetes and Meriones, was a Bowman. There is no contempt in the words used of him in N 313 f. Nor is

there in Nestor's coupling of bow and spear in H 140. Apollo has the bow in one of the finest of the theophanies, A 45 ff., and Artemis does not disdain it. Teucer and Pandarus had their skill with the bow from Apollo, O 441, B 827. And O 709, which Christ and others assign to the oldest *Iliad*, shews that archers were a force to be relied on in Homeric warfare. See *Hom. and his Age*, 136. We may grant that the use of sword and spear *ἐν αὐτοσταδίῃ* was the more glorious way of dealing with an enemy. But that the bow was in common use as an auxiliary weapon is certain (Finsler, 310), and that it was held in contempt is not proved.

But Dr. Monro goes on to say that the earlier importance of the bow survived only in tradition and romance, and that the Odysseus of the *Odyssey* thus gained a character as an archer which the Odysseus of the *Iliad* never had. But there is an archery contest in Ψ. If that book is late and Odyssean, then archery did not survive merely in tradition and romance. And the minute description in Δ 105-26, and the story in φ 11 ff. also seem to negative Dr. Monro's theory, which neglects the indication which we are pointing to in K. K was to him one of the late Odyssean books, but that we do not admit.

There are other indications in the poems of Odysseus' Cretan connection. Idomeneus had, before the *Troica*, often visited the Peloponnesus, Γ 232 f., and in τ 190 f. the disguised Odysseus speaks to Penelopé of a xenial bond between himself and that chieftain. Possibly the reading of some ancient copies of the *Odyssey*, after a 93, referring to Telemachus' projected journey,—κεῖθεν δὲ Κρήτηνδε παρ' Ἰδομενῆ ἄνακτα,—points in the same direction. See Geddes, *Problem*, 32 n.; Jebb, 130 n.; Drerup, *Homer*, 129; and Hennings, *Odyssee*, 56. Strongest of all, perhaps, are the allusions of the Pseudo-Odysseus, especially that in ξ 237 ff. The listening Eumeus, if we suppose he would be familiar with the Tale of Troy, τῆς τότ' ἄρα κλέος οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἵκανε, might have exclaimed, "Why, you must be Meriones himself!" Compare τ 181, and the well-known description of Crete which immediately precedes. It is told as if from close personal knowledge of the island. See Mr. Myres in *J.H.S.* xxvii. 176, and Drerup, 130. In this matter then K is in touch with other parts of the poems. And the connection is not a note of modernity (Leaf on Σ 590). Crete would be "far more

characteristically national and important" to a poet of early Greece than to a writer in historical times. That is now being made clearer month by month. For the bow in ancient Crete see *Scrip. Min.* i. 44, 79, and Reinach, *Le Disque de Phaistos*, 35 f.

## CHAPTER XXI

### MINOR AFFINITIES

THE *Unebenheiten* have been a great source of sustenance to the Higher Criticism. It sometimes admits *unus color* in the poems, but thinks it is shadowy and deceptive. A grain of difference is worth a pound of agreement. The critics love, in Aristotle's familiar words, to search for the "small dissimilarities"; they overlook the "large similarities." Both should be weighed. The general consistency has to be accounted for as well as the inconsistencies (Jevons, 33). Indeed the evidence from similarity is the stronger (Mure, i. 227 f, ii. 166). Anomalies there must be. In what early poet's work can a sharp-eyed Dissector not find them out by much searching? There are inconsistencies even in the works of the best modern writers. For examples see the books, especially Rothe's excellent treatise on the *Widersprüche* in Homer. "Such irregularities are actually evidence of unity of authorship" (*C.R.* xxiv. 118).

In regard to the Doloneia, all efforts are devoted to securing its isolation from the *Iliad*. We have seen, however, p. 128 *supra*, that its language shews even greater Iliadic than Odyssean affinity. But there is more. There is a wonderful amount of correspondence between K and the rest of the poems, particularly the books of the *Iliad*, in many points of style, technique and content, including what Mure describes as "delicate traits of conception and feeling."<sup>1</sup> These harmonies, "even the most subtle," can be ascribed by Professor Mahaffy (*Macm. Mag.* xxxviii. 414) and others to the Homerids working with "unity

<sup>1</sup> When Schmid, *Hom. Stud.* ii., is describing the attitude of the *Iliad* to Achaeans and Trojans respectively, he quotes K 8 times in 4 pages, which seems to indicate strong conformity to the rest of the poem. On the other

hand when Kammer (*Ästh. Komm.* 102-20) is enumerating and illustrating the propensities of the late contributors to the *Iliad*, he quotes K only (I think) once, in a great multitude of references to late books generally.

of purpose and feeling." It is possible, though origin in one mind seems a preferable explanation. But the difficulty is that there is no evidence (p. 21 *supra*) for these Homerids as a working school, whereas, had they ever manipulated the poems, references by the Alexandrians and others to them and their operations must surely have been frequent and express. If we find that all the popular concrete tests fail against the Doloneia, we shall be justified in concluding that the minute points of agreement confirm the presumption of unity of authorship.

One notices, in Homer, how the same language comes to be repeated of, or by, or to, or in connection with the same personage. We do not of course refer to phraseology of the nature of stereotyped epic commonplace, used by or of any of the *dramatis personae*, which would be in no way noteworthy; but to expressions mostly of a much less formal character, and used only in regard to certain individuals. The idea of imitation or borrowing is negatived in such cases. Association of ideas in one brain appears to be the cause operating to reproduce words already used of some one individual. Instances are numerous. The combination *καὶ γάρ τις τε* occurs 3 times, always in Odysseus' mouth. *σίγα* is used by him in 4 of its 5 occurrences; once by his son. The phrase *ἐπείγεσθαι* or *βιάζεσθαι βελέεσσι* is used 5 times of Aias, and never of any other hero. *ἡμιτελής* (*δόμος*) is ἄ. λ., B 701, and so is *ἡμιδαής* (*νηῦς*), II 294; in each case the word describes the property of Protesilaus. *κατ' οὐταμένην ὡτειλήν* is only Ξ 518 and P 86, in each case of a son of Panthous. For the protagonists of the two epics quite a long list could be made out. All this is certainly not due to chance. For explanation we have a choice between one poet, and generations of Homerids, or *λόγιοι ἀνδρεῖς*, upholding the tradition with a unity of practice on the most minute points which is positively marvellous.

To take some cases from K. We begin with the association, so often commented on, of Odysseus and Diomede in the *Iliad*. Their comradeship has the seal of Athené's protection. Their appeals to her in K, when starting for the plain, breathe the *deae parentis agnitiō*. Compare them with the prayer of Diomede in E 115 ff.—the invocation in each case, the allusion to Tydeus, the *νῦν αὐτέ με φῖλαι*; and with the *οὐδέ σε λήθω* of Odysseus to Athené the *οὐδέ με λήσεις* of Athené to him, ν 393.

*παρίσταμαι ἥδε φυλάσσω* occurs only K 291, E 809, ν 301, always of Athené's care for her favourites. So *παρίσταμαι* and *φυλάσσω* separately in a number of places with the same reference. Again, *ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοισι*, K 245, 279, ν 301, ν 48, of Odysseus (cf. *ἐν πάντεσσι δόλοισι*, Athené to Odysseus, ν 292). Compare again the opening line, K 249, of Odysseus' reply to Diomede, with Agamemnon present, with Agamemnon's own reply to Odysseus, Δ 359. The conversation, we may add, illustrates the common observation that there is no false modesty about the Achaean hero (Schneidewin, *Hom. Naivität*, 126). Note in it also the *ἀλλ’ ἵμεν*, 251, the "heroic rule of conduct" in the Homeric poems as in Northern heroic literature (Ker, 9). The most famous instance in the former is Sarpedon's call to Glaucus, M 328. Again, compare K 550 and A 262 (see also γ 221), all in the mouth of Nestor, whose appeals to his hearers in H 172 and K 212 ff. are also in similar tone. His remark in K 104 f. of Hector is very like Hector's own reference to Achilles, Τ 369 f. His *νῦν ὅφελεν πονέεσθαι*, κ.τ.λ., 117 f., recalls his own procedure in O 659 f. It is exactly similar to Sarpedon's exhortation in E 490 ff. But no one could suggest imitation. In 25 ff. and δ 145 ff., and nowhere else, we have *πόλεμον θρασὺν ὄρμαίνοντες*; in the former of apprehension felt by Menelaus, in the latter in words used to him. In K 41, the last four words are quite in a style usual with that hero. See his pithy conclusions, P 32, 105, and much the same, Α 469, ο 71. He had a reputation for wisdom of a kind, γ 328, δ 190 f., 264. And see his utterances, Γ 108 ff., Ψ 604. In regard to Menelaus, again, we are frequently reminded that it was on his behalf that "many drew sword and died" at Troy. See Mure, vol. i. 324, and B 161 f., 177 f., Γ 99, 128, E 567, Ξ 88 f. and other passages. And so K 26 f. Again, there is some disparagement of the hero in the *Iliad*. See Leaf on P 588, and cf. P 26. There is something of the sort in Agamemnon's *χείρονα*, K 238, and his admission to Nestor in 121, with which cf. δ 372. And two other small points. With the wording of 129 f., cf. the *ὅτρύνων πόλεμόνδε* of B 589 and the *νεμεσήσεται* of P 93 and 100. And lastly, when Menelaus rises from his bed in K, it is said, 29, that with a leopard's skin *μετάφρενον εύρù κάλυψε*. This is no conventional expression. It does not recur. But it consists perfectly with Γ 210.

Akin to such cases are those in which a line or passage appears to be a mere echo of another. The same poet seems to be using language which is governed as to its form by a phrase previously employed. For example, Νέστωρ οἶος ἔριζεν, B 555, N. οἶος ἔμιμνε, Θ 80, N. αὐ τότ' ἐφῆζε, γ 411, all three commencing the verse. Similarly compare, word for word, K 18 and N 91, and see in K 11 ff. and Σ 496 ff. the occurrences of αὐλῶν συρίγγων τ' and αὐλοὶ φόρμιγγές τε, θαυμάζω, and the initial syllable of ἀθρήσειε and ἀθρόοι. In K 368 and E 119 we have a curious combination, applied in both cases to Diomedes, and not recurring, of the words φθάνω, ἐπεύχομαι, and βάλλω. We may, if we please, say all this is due to chance, but I do not think we need to confess ourselves so helpless.

In points of epic technique the poet adheres to practice faithfully. He shares the dramatic faculty which is so prominent everywhere in the poems. It is in great measure from the lips of the sufferers themselves that we realise the plight of the Achaeans in K. αὐτὸν γὰρ δεῖ τὸν ποιητὴν ἐλάχιστα λέγειν. The poet of K seems to conform scrupulously to the laws, investigated by Zielinski (*Behandlung d. gleichzeit. Ereignisse*), which regulate the development of the action and the ordering of events in it. He abhors a vacuum, and fills up in the approved manner, 299 ff. and 515 ff., what would otherwise be a gap in his narrative. The similitudes are as in other books. They are taken from the same subjects; there is the same masterly variety of treatment. We are familiar, from E 554 and N 198, with the pair of lions in K 297. With 485 cf. O 325, and with the simile in the pursuit in 360 ff. that in another famous chase, X 189 ff. The portent of war in K 8 recalls one sent from Heaven in Δ 75-84 and another in P 547 ff. Another parallel of the kind is noticed, p. 184 *infra*. After the words ἐρυθαινετο δ' αἴματι γαῖα, 484, comes a simile. It is remarkable that the same thing occurs thrice elsewhere, Δ 452, Τ 495, Φ 22. Our poet, if late and imitative, has succeeded in this department of his enterprise in a way that must strike us as remarkable. A school of Homerids, the inheritors and slaves of particular methods, style, and expression, and even borrowing "ready-made" similes from a common stock (p. 207 *infra*), seems, in face of the phenomena, to be absolutely excluded. The humble hypothesis of one mind for the whole *Iliad* is surely better than either.

There is just the variety in the midst of general similarity which is found throughout the epics. The similes in the *Idylls of the King* are more abundant even than in Homer. They can be classified with results which correspond closely to those yielded by a classification of the Homeric images. Poets have their favourite subjects, methods and ways.

Compare, again, to take some minor miscellaneous points, the asyndeta in K 547 and Γ 158; or the pleonasm in lines like Λ 164, T 214, and λ 612, with that in the condensed picture of carnage in K 298. *Tum copia tum brevitate mirabilis.* In the matter of nomenclature we may mention Δόλων Εύμηδεος νιός with Ἀντίνοος Εύπειθεος νιός in the *Odyssey* and Μάρων Εύάνθεος νιός, i 197. Many stray references disclose the same unstudied likeness. The way in which primitive folk measure distance, very familiar to sojourners in the East, is illustrated in K 351 f. and 357, as in Γ 12, Ο 358 and other places. For the noisiness of the Trojans, so often said to be set against the more seemly calm and self-restraint of the Achaeans, cf. the κλαγγή τε καὶ ἀσπετος ὥρτο κυδοιμός of 523, and see Schmid, *Hom. Stud.* ii. 8 f. For Thracian metal-work, 438, see Leaf's note on N 577 and the passages cited. The gleam of arms is often described with beautiful effect, as in 153 f. The vow of a βοῦς to Athené, 292 ff., reappears in γ 382 ff.; cf. Z 308 ff. and Λ 729. In 214 ff. the importance of feasts in the Homeric economy is recognised as in, e.g., Δ 259, 343, Θ 162, M 311, 319 f. Compare K 211 f. with the similar thought in Π 247, and K 208 f. with X 384. The story of Tydeus, told in several books of the *Iliad*, is introduced again in K. There is no indication of plagiarism whatever. See Terret, 235.

The familiarity with country life and the joy in the chase which are evident throughout the *Iliad*, are found in K in a number of passages. We have also the appreciation of the points of a horse, and the admiration for the animal, that are so conspicuous in the poems. See *Juv. Mundi*, 519. The references attach K to the rest of the poem. Achilles' horses are described in the same terms as in P 76 ff. They are not to be driven by man born of woman. We can at least say that there is no borrowing by the poet of K (p. 123 *supra*). Rhēsus' team have a glowing couplet, 436 f. They are white as the snow and swift as the winds. Cf. Π 149, T 415, T 226 ff. For intimate knowledge of equine ways,

see K 492 f. and E 230 f. For the association of Diomede, ἵππόδαμος himself and son of Tydeus ἵππόδαμος (Mure, ii. 86 ff.), with the capture of horses, see his three exploits in E. With K 537 cf. E 264, 324. Altogether K, like Ψ, exhibits affection for and interest in "the lordly animal," and both are awkward for Principal Geddes' argument that this attitude is not apparent in the "Ulyssean" area of the *Iliad*. See Miss Clerke, *Studs.* 66 f., on the "overwhelming evidence as to homogeneity of sentiment" on this point throughout the poem.

And lastly and negatively, we appeal to Dissectors themselves, and ask if our poet is not almost unique among the horde of the late intruders into the *Iliad*. Here are no un-Homeric myths, no prosy reminiscences of Nestor—*inepta non dicit*,—no legends of Hērakles (though his lion-skin is supposed to be there), or of Dionysus or of the Argonauts, no Hesiodic Catalogue, no lyrics, no Athenians. As in the good *Ur-Ilias* (Robert, 174), the gods do not take the shape of birds. None of these marks of late composition is to be found in K. Nor does the poet stoop to chronicle any of the debased practices that the Cyclic poems were familiar with, nor to their childishness. The exploit in K is one worthy of the heroic age. Odysseus and Diomede do not sit under the wall of Troy and hear the Trojan women chattering a φῆμις. They are not yet the degraded Odysseus and Diomede of the Cyclices (Mure, i. 394, ii. 144, 307). All this is strange if the Doloneia is late; passing strange if it is even a century and more later than the *Cypria*, as Leaf and Jebb and others suggest. In K we seem still to be in the wide and pleasant and healthy expanse, "that deep-browed Homer ruled as his demesne."

And, to return for a moment to the minute coincidences in the matters of diction, style and technique which we have dwelt on above. If these are to be attributed to the influence of a school, if the Doloneia is to be considered the work of one or more of its members so saturated with epic ways that he or they could not neglect the tradition in so many minute points, how are we to explain the deviations from the commonplace, which he or they must have been equally familiar with, which the critics specify? The inconsistency here may be illustrated from the use of the word ποικίλος by the author of K. His use of it with δίφρος is a solitary one, and from this and other similar mistakes it is inferred that he was late and ignorant of epic

usage. But in one respect his dealings with the word are in marvellous consistency with the rest of the *Iliad*. He uses *ποικίλα* 4 times, always in the second half of the verse; in its other 7 occurrences in the *Iliad* it is always found there. Other inflections, *ποικίλον -ov -η*, occur 5 times in other books of the poem, always initial in the verse; and so they are in K, 3 times. That is only a specimen of a conformity with the rest of the *Iliad* which could be greatly expanded,<sup>1</sup> and which seems to furnish strong proof of unity of authorship. But here I only urge that such wonderful adherence to practice is utterly destructive of that part of the case against K, which is based on the alleged misuse or neglect of a few epithets and other pieces of commonplace.

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, the occurrences of (ἀνὰ) γλαφυράς, in K and in the rest of *ἀείρας*, *μάχεσθαι*, *δίψι* ἀμύμονα, *νῆσας ἐπι* the *Iliad*.

## CHAPTER XXII

### SOME DIFFICULTIES

MANY of the difficulties of the critics have been considered above. A few still remain. If the result of our discussion of them all is to leave, in the opinion of some, a residuum that still offends, we can only say that K is not peculiar in that respect among the Homeric lays. Nor are the epics peculiar among the compositions of early poets generally, or when compared with modern works. The treatises are full of examples of mistakes and absurdities from Goethe and Schiller, Shakespeare, Chaucer, Milton, Defoe, Scott, Dickens, and, it might be added, any other author that the too exacting critic whom Comparetti describes as a "man-microscope" has ever examined. For the *Oldest English Epic* see Professor Gummere's work on it, 7 ff. "Adventures in the old cycles were not made to modern order." For *Faust* see van Gennep, *Quest.* 9; for the *Aeneid*, Mure, i. App. F; for Aristotle himself, the preface to Bywater's *Poetics*. If "the master of them that know" is guilty of "inconsistency of thought" and "lapses of memory," are we to be hard on the carelessness or the liberties of an old epic poet? Mr. Allen has recently protested (*C.Q.* iii. 226) against a philological strait-waistcoat for Homer. With regard to the *Realien*, the critics almost bind him with fetters. See also Cauer, *Grdfrgn.* 363.

Ancient conditions are disregarded. The poet is to be kept to the issue. Nothing irrelevant is to be tolerated. In what lawyers call "the pleadings," that is, in his proëm, he refers to dogs and vultures. So decent burial must not be mentioned, or Fick tears out the references. And nothing must retard the action. When Zeus promises the Achaeans shall suffer defeat, the critics require it to come at once (*Calebow, Il. lib. oct.* 29).

And nothing rare or not common shall enter in. Above all, there must be logical consistency—*une logique froide, un équilibre verbal constant* (van Gennep, *Quest.* 18). All irregularity and inequality are barred. It is a modern view (Strickland, *La Quest. Omerica*, 99). Aristotle himself saw absurdities in the poetry, but he made light of them. The poet ἀφανίζει ἡδύνων τὸ ἄτοπον. The Pursuit of Hector and the Slaughter of the Wooers are full of difficulties; they are, as the Doloneia is said to be, “crammed with strange things.” But these did not to the men of old suggest spuriousness or any other sinister inference. They did not cry “impossible,” like the modern critic (Harder, *Homer*, 247). G. Lange (*Poet. Einheit. d. II.* 43 n.) quotes Montesquieu as blaming, as a most fertile source of error in literary criticism, the application to past centuries of the ideas of the day in which one lives. That is the fault of much of the Higher Criticism of Homer. The standards and tests applied are modern. An ancient auditory cared for none of these things, and the bard that sang for it thought as little of them. It was of Shakespeare himself that Herder (quoted by Grimm in the *Deutsche Rundschau*, 1892, 92) wrote: *in der Absicht des Dichters, im Haupte des Dichters, da verschwindet Ort und Zeit und disparater Inhalt.* Homer only asks fair treatment. Poets and story-tellers have always, except to the Higher Criticism, had the privilege “of daring anything.” When Stevenson wants a certain law of Treasure Trove in France, he states it as he wants it, adding, “let it be so for my tale.” He can also, “for his tale,” make Richard Crookback a duke before his time. I have seen it mentioned that Goethe’s reply to an objection about one of his characters was a simple “I wanted him so.”

#### *The Horses of Rhēsus.*

Many critics make much of the fact that these steeds are not given a place in Ψ. Dr. Leaf (vol. i. 423) says mention “would seem inevitable.” Professor Mahaffy (p. 83) thinks some allusion there was “necessary, if a single poet had been thinking out his story”; forgetfulness of this grand capture of steeds, so “much finer” than Aeneas’ pair, which Diomede ran in Ψ, is not to be defended. But we have no warrant for saying they were much finer. It is not stated that they were

of divine descent. The other pair were. But is it meant that Diomede should have entered both teams? There were already two divine pairs competing. Must the poet burden his lay with a third of supreme excellence? Is there not incident enough in the race already? The poet may well have refrained deliberately from complicating matters by introducing the Thracian team. We cannot admit the *necessity* for their being even mentioned. "Necessary" and "inevitable" seem to be too strong terms. They remind us of the "imperative duty" (Leaf, vol. i. 193) on the poet of mentioning the treachery of Pandarus when Diomede killed him. If these terms are correct, why have interpolating busybodies never supplied the omissions? The παροπάματα are not in the poems only. And there is always the possibility that the *Iliad* was, though the work of one man, not composed in its present order, "at one projection" (p. 141 *supra*).

### *Riding.*

See App. L. It is not proved that the heroes rode back to camp. Many critics are convinced that they drove. But even if it were proved that they rode, the inference that this proves K to be late (Leaf on 513) would not be admissible. The argument appears to be that anything uncommon proves lateness. Riding is mentioned, outside K, only in two similes, O 679 and ε 371. Therefore K is late. It is enough to say *non sequitur*. We are equally entitled to say that three instances prove riding was familiar. We cannot find anything in the poems to justify us in expecting frequent mention of the practice. The inference of lateness would have force only if we granted, which would be absurd, that riding was of late origin. It was not, and there would be nothing remarkable in the heroes being represented as riding once, in very exceptional circumstances, ἐξ ἀνάγκης. See Reichel, 40 f. Cauer (*Grdfrgn.* 268), who believes that K is "perhaps the youngest of the lays of the *Iliad*," considers that to its author riding, as a practice common in his age, is "more vividly present" than the "conventional idea" of the war-chariot. But nothing is more vividly present to the author's mind than the chariot, while, if riding was specially so, his reticence in his description of it is quite remarkable.

*Absence of the Wall.*

See Dr. Leaf's note on 11 ff. for the "prosaic solutions" in the scholia of the difficulty,—how could Agamemnon, in bed in his hut, see the Trojan fires beyond the wall? But was he in his hut?  $\nu\eta\tau\pi\alpha\rho\pi\mu\nu\gamma$ , 35, is against it. Nestor and Diomede were sleeping outside their quarters, 74 and 151. The weather was warm. See Seymour, *Life*, 180 n. I think he might have added A 476 to his references. Even if Agamemnon was inside, Paley (*a.l.*) finds no difficulty. Cf. Ebel. *s.v.*  $\delta\theta\rho\acute{e}\omega$ .

The poet knows the wall. See p. 2 n. *supra*. Did he forget it in 11 f.? We need not assume that. The Trojans are on high ground, 160; cf. Λ 56. The *praetorium* may have been on the highest spot in the camp,  $\epsilon\phi'\bar{\iota}\psi\acute{o}us$  (*schol.*). That might explain why the Generalissimo was not in the centre, Θ 222 f. and Λ 5 f. And *καταβήσομεν*, K 97, may indicate that the wall was on a lower level. So Agamemnon may have been able to see over the wall, unless his hut was very near it. But Dr. Leaf on Η 37 tells us that it was at some distance. And finally, the wall was not of the same height throughout, N 683. All this is prosaic, but so are the discussions of the point. Dr. Leaf seems to forget his own remark on K 447, "an epic poet is not a realist." It is prosaic to read more into the poet's statement than that the light from the thousand fires, and the Trojan music, struck dismay to the already overwrought mind of Agamemnon.

*The Baths.*

Odysseus and Diomede, after a douche of sea-water,  $\epsilon\acute{s}\rho\acute{e}\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{v}\thetao\acute{v}s\beta\acute{a}n\tau\acute{e}s\acute{e}v\xi\acute{e}\sigma\tau\acute{a}s\lambdao\acute{u}\sigma\alpha\tau\acute{o}$ , 576. Dr. Leaf only grumbles in his impatience with the author of K. The bath is "hardly part of a camp-equipage,"—at least not one of the Tiryns size. Of course a smaller one will do. Fick (*Iliad*, 479) objects to the warm bath after the sea bath. Dr. Leaf points out that it is the natural order. 576 f. are regarded as interpolated. They "can be cut out," and 576 occurs twice in the *Odyssey*, as also a line like 577. So the couplet is Odyssean and condemned.

Bathing, whether from tubs or in bath-rooms, was surely an ancient practice. The bath at Tiryns and tubs found in Crete are good vouchers. See, e.g., Mr. Blakeney's note (*Transl. of Il. 274*), and Ludewig, *Schliemanns Ausgrabn.* 44. But it is objected that baths are not mentioned elsewhere in the *Iliad*, and that the Achaeans would not bring such things to Troy. But see X 442 ff. and Σ 346 ff., and cf. Ψ 39 ff. It is unreasonable to be too severe on the poet's omissions. Shakespeare makes no mention of Magna Charta in *King John*. Was mention not "imperative" and "inevitable"? Yet the poet conceives the Achaeans as having brought to Troy, besides chariots and horses, certain articles *de luxe*, as the chest that Thetis packed, and Nestor's cup and table. Or were these latter loot, like Achilles' φόρμυξ, I 186? That much plunder was got in Troyland, we know. The chiefs had "wealth of gold, silver," etc. (Leaf on K 215). Then need we deny them baths? Mr. Myres tells us they were scrupulously cleanly (*J.H.S.* xxvii. 180).—The word ἀσάμυθος seems old enough (Fick, *Vorgriech. Ortsnam.* 154, and *Hattiden u. Danubier*, 49; cf. Lewy, *Semit. Fremdwört.* 155 n.). Some trace it to the root in Σμυνθεύς, Doederlein quoting Horace's *qui rore puro*. The thing and name were, Fick says, Mycenaean.

### *A Crowded Night.*

Professor Murray (*H.G.L.* 1907, 20) thinks K, placed where it is, "impossible." It makes "a night of portentous length" and "rends in two a continuous narrative." We have argued in our first chapter that it is far from impossible in its present place. And the continuity is unbroken. We have heard the same complaint in other cases,—of the Irus episode in the *Odyssey*, of the death of Tlepolemus in the *Iliad*, etc. It might be made of most episodes. Other critics support the objection, as Ludwich (*Die hom. Frage u. ihre Beantwortg.* 3) and Sittl (*H.G.L.* 93). Ranke (p. 19), analysing the narrative, pronounces it "impossible in regard to time." But only two watches of the night were gone when the heroes started, K 253. There had been plenty of time for what had gone before, and there remained more than enough for what was to come. The night is occupied by a deputation, a short sleep and the expedition,

no more. See Brandt in *Jahrb. k. P.* 1888, 102. But this way of judging an old epic poet is intolerable. Ancient audiences would not object. The more the thanes got of such lays, the better. They had no doubt, like Prometheus on the Caucasus, more leisure than they cared to have. And the night was *μακρὴ ἀθέσφατος*. They would not reckon up events and estimate time, or grumble at "superfluity of business" (Miss Clerke, *Studs.* 96).<sup>1</sup> It does not, she says, trouble the *genially* disposed reader. Lachmann (*Betrachtgn.* 28; Bernhardy, 164) and his followers evolved a law of the "*Sparsamkeit* of the Epos." There is one; it does not forbid an abundance of splendid scenes. No room for a fine episode? Blass (*Interpol.* 8) answers, "it has to be there!" Too much for Odysseus in one night? An ancient listener to the Saga would laugh at the idea (Kiene, *Epen d. Hom.* ii. 93).

*O notte veramente Omerica!* is a true word spoken in jest, by Macinai (*L'Iliade*, i. p. xxiv.). It was a Homeric night, as the day that commences with Α is a Homeric day lasting for seven and a half books,—on which see Rothe in his *Widersprüche*, 30 ff. He can produce parallels. He notes that there are critics who actually want to extend the long drawn out fighting by making Achilles in Σ rush into the fight at once. Robert, however (*Stud.* 125), tries to make the day into two. And see Jäger (*Hom. Aph.* 179) on *Hermann and Dorothea*, and for Nitzsch's objection to the fullness of the night in θ-μ, Dr. Monro in his *Odyssey*, 319 f. Vergil's imitation is as bad. He "not infrequently puts more into a day than is possible or probable" (Heinze, 341). There is a difficulty only if we judge old poetry by our own artistic predilections. Homer did not have modern connoisseurs and their *longueurs* in his mind. He was entitled to fill his canvas in his own way. For K, Stier and others can forgive the extension of the night only to lead to a morning of rejoicing, with the spirits of the Achaeans restored by a dashing feat of arms. That is the point that listeners to the lay would mark, and their satisfaction is the poet's justification. *Meredem si quam petiit, plausus fuit et laus aequalium auditorum* (Wolf, *Prolegg.* xxii.). His audience was all in all to him (Butcher, *Aspects*, 182). And one thing we may predicate of them with certainty,—they were not so ready to find fault as some of the Homeric critics of the nineteenth century.

*The Expedition a Failure.*

This has often been asserted, quite seriously. Well, Hector was foiled. That was something. The scouts ascertained the positions of the various units of the Trojan force, and that there was to be no attack that night. That was something more, and the heroes themselves were satisfied. See what Diomede tells Dolon, 448. And Hector's arrogant confidence had got a fall. How can it be said the mission failed?

But no formal report was made. A modern scout would have saluted Agamemnon and told his story. The poet takes another way. The "great deed" promised by implication, 282, was the main thing to him and his audience. The latter would not care whether it was formally reported or not. Modern ideas on such a point are of no moment. And it *was* a "great deed." It has been said that, "it may be given to a couple of scouts to effect what a brigade of cavalry may attempt in vain." Odysseus and Diomede were as useful in the present case.

*The Opening Simile.*

This has been the mark for much unfavourable criticism. Nearly all that can be said against it has been said by Dr. Leaf, *a.l.* It has not been read carefully. Agamemnon's groans are not, as Kuhlbars says (p. 16), compared to thunder or rain. Their frequency<sup>1</sup> is compared to that of lightning,—but not in a thunderstorm, for none is mentioned. The rain, hail, snow and war are all calamities that such lightning presages. Agamemnon's "cares are like lightning before a storm" (Platt in *J. Phil.* xxiv. 33). The critics who regard the lightning, rain, hail, and snow<sup>2</sup> as part of one storm, must accept war also as a meteorological phenomenon, and the storm as one that never was on land or sea. One can easily understand how early man would take lightning by itself as a *τέρας ή πολέμου,* *ἢ καὶ χειμῶνος δυσθαλπέος*, as readily as he would a rainbow,

<sup>1</sup> Just as in M 278 ff. "The comparison lies between the frequency of the snowflakes and the volley of missiles" (Mr. Blakeney's note).

<sup>2</sup> Snow is still regarded with horror

in Greece. A traveller has lately told us how he once saw the whole male population of a village take to bed when snow fell, and remain there till the snow had disappeared.

P 547 ff., or a meteor, Δ 75 f. Cf. also ν 112 ff. For the illustration of mental distress or perplexity by reference to the processes of nature, see the fine similes in Ξ 16 and I 4 ff.

*The Offer of the Ewes and Lambs.*

Fick considers the inducement held out by Nestor in 213 ff. (on which see also p. 223 *infra*) "simply absurd." Others agree. In his first edition Dr. Leaf thought of the influence of the "democratic *σίτησις ἐν πρυτανείῳ*." In his second he has substituted for this speculation the suggestion that the author was "introducing a touch of heroic simplicity,"—archaising in fact (p. 197 *infra*). The Leyden editors expunge 214-7, as what is promised is nothing, seeing that all present except Meriones and Thrasymēdes are already entitled to participate in the feasts of the chiefs. But the words *δαίτησι καὶ εἰλαπίνησι* cannot be restricted to these banquets. The passage is also discussed by Peppmüller in *Jahrb. k. P.* 1894, 347 f. Mr. Lawson, *a.l.*, has a new rendering, "ever at feast or banquet there will be to hand, *i.e.* there will always be a lamb ready to slaughter and serve up." And the value of the gift may not have been so insignificant as is sometimes assumed. The expression *ὅσσοι γὰρ νήεσσιν ἐπικρατέουσιν ἄριστοι* need not be restricted to the first-class chiefs, though we can hardly, with Stier, *a.l.*, assume a ewe and a lamb from every ship. Flocks and herds were one great source of wealth and importance in the heroic age (*Haake, Der Besitz in homn. Zeitalter*, 4 f.).

Another point is, why *black* ewes? The scholiasts said because the heroes were going into the night, and the same has been said of recent years. The idea may be dismissed. Pierron says, *a.l.*, because *on les croyait plus robustes et plus fécondes*. He does not give any authority, and my enquiries have failed to elicit any confirmation. I have seen it stated that in the south of Italy black sheep are kept because there abounds in that region a plant, *Hypericum crispum*, which kills white sheep in a fortnight, but does not injure black. See Darwin's *Plants and Animals under Domestication*, ii. 212. A friend in the Department of Agriculture in Whitehall has kindly had the point investigated, with the result that this notion has been proved to be false. No *Hypericum* is credited with poisonous properties.

But the idea is proved to be an old one, and the Troad is a likely locality for *Hypericum crispum*. The belief may be as old as Homer.

There is not sufficient ground for condemning the passage. The promise does, we may admit, sound a strange one to us.<sup>1</sup> We expect something grander where the great chiefs are concerned, but we must beware of judging Homeric matters by our modern ideas. That the offer is unique is also no ground for rejection. If it were, we should have to give up much that everybody retains; "half of Homer must be explained as un-Homeric" (Hennings, *Odyssee*, 54 n.). See, for example, Dr. Leaf (vol. ii. 318) on the episode of the speaking horse. Would that he were always as prudent with suspected matter! Think again how little we know of the Homeric Age, and how much there was in it that we know nothing of. Archaeology threatens or demolishes speculative conclusions against the genuineness of passages. *Ne damnemus quod non intellegimus*. And again, the humble offer of Nestor is perhaps deliberately contrasted with the splendid guerdon promised by Hector. There is also a shrewd remark by M. and R. in their excellent commentary (on δ 174), that "there is an Oriental feature about such overtures . . . that they are never thought of by the offerer as likely to be accepted." In a Bavarian epic, gold and silver are produced, "and he who had courage enough to go a-scouting was bidden *fill his shield*. But none offered" (Jiriczek, 67). It may also be noticed that there is a good deal that is open to similar criticism in the offer of Ascanius in Vergil's imitation of the Doloneia. It was unnecessary to promise any reward at all, but, in the then plight of the Trojans, to dispose of the horse and arms of Turnus might almost be condemned as ridiculous. See Plüss in *Jahrb. k. P.* 1888, 185 ff.

#### *Odysseus' Three Meals.*

Three between sunset and dawn! The ancients were the first to remark on this λαιμαργύλα (Bonitz, *Ursprung*, 89, quoting Athenaeus). Odysseus was a robustious eater; Bonitz proves

<sup>1</sup> Rhapsodes were called ἀπρωδοι (Bergk, 491 n.), as a lamb was sometimes a prize for recitation. At a recent

celebration of the Olympic Games a lamb was presented to the winner of the race from Marathon to Athens.

that from the *Odyssey*, and cf. Lawton, 226.  $\gammaαστέρα δ' οὐ πως$   $\epsilon\sigmaτιν ἀποκρύψαι μεμανίαν$ , the hero himself says, p 286. But it shewed some Dissectors that K was added after I by a strange hand. Its author did not notice that Odysseus had already fed twice in I, and no subsequent diaskeuast modified K 578. But recent critics do not press a point which was really not worth raising. It reminds us of Zoilus' disapproval of Achilles' call to Patroclus,  $\zetaωρότερον δὲ κέρατε$ , I 203 (Lehrs, *Ar.* 203). Only the  $\deltaαὶ$  in Achilles' quarters could be objected to. But it was complimentary. It cannot be asserted that Odysseus indulged immoderately. He could not but partake. He could not have refused Achilles'  $\xiείνια$ , especially when charged, I 180 f.,  $\piειρᾶν$   $\omegaς πεπίθοιεν ἀμύμονα Πηλείωνα$ . And perhaps *plenus venter suadet libenter!* As to the  $\deltaεῖπνον$  in the morning, Odysseus had sensible views about not fighting on an empty stomach, T 167 ff.

### *Minora.*

There are other small stumbling-blocks. If we mention a few, we shall be justifying ourselves in not cataloguing them all. A discrepancy is detected between K 266 and I 447, which seem to locate Amyntor in Boeotia and Thessaly respectively. See Monro, Lawson, Am.-H., Leaf and Paley on these passages. We might accept in I 447 'Ορμένιον πολύμηλον or πολύπυρον instead of 'Ελλάδα καλλιγύναικα. Ludwich's note *a.l.* shews that the new reading has some authority. But see Mr. Allen in *C.R.* xx. 198.<sup>1</sup> Still smaller points will be found in Sickel's work, 9 f. He has some strange observations. He objects to K 203 and to the  $\epsilon\rho\omegaδιός$  in 274. Line 295 is "superfluous" when Athéné has already shewn, by sending the bird, that she is at hand to help. He even notices the old *crux interpretum*, how Diomede knows Dolon's name, and quotes the Scholiast's explanations, either to read  $\deltaολῶν \omegaς νοῶν$  in 447, or to take it as natural that in' the course of a ten years' war some of the warriors would get to know some of their opponents' names. Wilamowitz (*Über das Θ der Ilias*, 379 n.) thinks K 170 shews that the poet (unlike the rest of the *Iliad*) gave Nestor more than

<sup>1</sup> See also P. Friedländer's *Herakles*, 19 n. He observes that the Amyntoridae of Ormenium were a Rhodian family, and thinks the reference in K may be an indication of its Rhodian origin.

two sons. For Thrasymēdes was at the moment on outpost duty and could not be referred to in the plural *παῖδες*. And so on. Naber (p. 167) notices the slip *τρισκαιδέκατον* in 561, but only to record a word of blame for those who descend to such trifles. *Ipsi suo se gladio jugulant.* But Naber's own work makes good use of irregularities of every kind for the work of disruption. G. Lange (*Jb.* 1880, 138) catalogues the expressions by which Naber labels the phenomena on which he relies,—*absurda, inepta, stulta, mira, difficilia, incredibilia, ridicula, indigna*. It is hardly for Naber to throw a stone with so much glass of his own in jeopardy.

## CHAPTER XXIII

### ARMOUR AND DRESS

THE author of K is condemned by some, as by Dr. Leaf in his *Introduction*, and Ranke, 32 f., for his “peculiar delight in the minute description of dress and weapons.” They overlook the nature of the action in K and they overstate their case. Homer’s “art of clear representation” of things has always been recognised, and commended. See, e.g., Harder, *Homer*, 248 f. and 270, and references there; Erhardt, *Entstg.* xcv.; and Adam, *Das Plastische im Homer*, 108 ff. The habit of minute description is a peculiarity of the primitive Epic Muse everywhere (Mure, ii. 5 ff.). It corresponds to the conditions of an early, simple society. Only critics affected with what Jäger (*Hom. u. Hor.* 112) calls the *Blasierheit* of a world grown old, can be offended by it; cf. Filipsky, *Das stehende Beiwort im Volksepos*, 8. It appears in Beowulf. See some excellent remarks in Arnold’s edition, p. xx., on the “naive and fresh delight” and the “Homeric colour” that characterise the accounts of “everything belonging to or used by man.” It is the same in the *Sháhnáma* and in the *Nibelungenlied*. It is found in the Irish Epic. Mr. Lang (*Cornhill Mag.* 1908, 499) infers that early audiences liked it. Can any one doubt it?

For Homer no one who knows the poems requires references. “The whole business of life comes bodily into the epic poem” (Ker, 9, and cf. 16 f.). Meals, sacrifices, gardening, a lady’s toilet, seafaring operations; huts, cars, bowls and cups and other articles *de luxe* (as in δ 123-36), are all described in detail. Especially arms,—the mace of Areithous, the corslet of Meges, the shields of Aias, Sarpedon, and Achilles. A bow in Δ has 22 lines devoted to it; Mure describes the passage as a little epic on archery. Another in φ is celebrated at still greater length.

There is a story attached to it, as to the famous casque in K. Truly our poet does not lack precedent. And he is not long-winded. There comes a time in some literatures when the simple, unadorned pictures of early days are replaced by inflated artificial descriptions with rhetorical striving (Ker, 330 ff.). K shews the simplicity that appears in the poems generally. The critics exaggerate unfairly. See some excellent remarks by Bougot (p. 199 f.) endorsed by Terret (p. 231). Far from being exuberant, the descriptions in K are, he says, *composées de traits frappants mais en petite nombre*. That is literally true. The criticism we are meeting seems petty. Dr. Leaf (*Introduction to T*) compares with this blot which he has discovered in K, the love of the author of T for the prosaic details of eating and drinking. "They belong to the decadence of the 'great manner.'" If we turn to *Homer and his Age*, 54 and 79, what a different complexion its author, who knows something of saga and feudal practice, puts on this whole scene in T!

It is further objected that the dress and armour are of an uncouth kind and such as we hear of nowhere else, except perhaps in Γ 17 (Paris' leopard-skin). As to the skins which three of the heroes wrap about their persons *at night*, they were evidently, as Mr. Lang (*op. cit.* 260 f.) says, the equivalents of our dressing-gowns. Professor Henry's parallel (*C.R.* xx. 98) of Napoleon and his staff "in striped pyjamas" seems extreme. Skins were useful also for protective purposes (Seymour, *Life*, 648, 653, and Murray, 138). In the *Sháhnáma* we have the cuirass of tiger or leopard skin. As regards the gear which Odysseus and Diomede don before they start, we must consider the circumstances, of which many objectors say not a word. Where is there another *Nyktegersia*? There is an expedition somewhat like that of Odysseus and Diomede in § 462 ff., and there, as in K, we do find much about the equipment of the warriors, who do not go out in helmets, greaves and corslets. The panoply for day work was not suitable for a reconnaissance by night. Odysseus, Diomede and Dolon must move quickly, and quietly (Albracht, *Kampf u. Kampfschildrg.* ii. 7). The gleam of metal might be fatal, as in *Aen.* ix. 373 f., and *Nibelungenlied*, 1656, 1896. The caps or basnets were quite appropriate to the occasion (Reichel, 101 ff.; Leaf, *App. B.* 581 ff.; and Lang, *H.* and *A.* 173). So for the body-coverings. Reichel

(p. 53) sees nothing strange in Dolon's wolf-skin.<sup>1</sup> Other bowmen, as Paris and Hērakles, wear skins. In fact the gear is *parfaitement motivé* (Terret, 229 ff., and Jordan, *Erzählgsst.* 63). Friedländer (*Zw. h. W.* 779) approves the careful clothing of Nestor for the night air. We are surely not to assume that it is sheer perversity in the poet that makes him represent the old man as taking a cloak, instead of putting on the armour lying beside him.

But, it is said, these things do not reappear in the poems. We have given a reason. Many of the uncouth weapons described in the *Catalogue* in *Aen.* vii. are not mentioned again by Vergil. Critics do not there assume spuriousness. But are they correct as to K? In  $\nu$  436 Odysseus, disguised as a gaberlunyie, gets from Athené a deer-skin. Laertes,  $\omega$  231, had on a cap of goat-skin, and,  $\omega$  228, gaiters of leather, not greaves of bronze. He was gardening, not fighting. If Diomede in K sleeps on an ox-hide, so does Odysseus in  $\nu$  2,—cf. 96 and 142. See also Λ 843. Telemachus rests,  $a$  443, covered by a sheep-skin. For what purpose does Eumaeus,  $\xi$  530, cf. 519, take the skin of a great goat? Like Nestor in K, he,  $\xi$  529, also takes a big thick cloak. The  $\chiλαῖναι ἀνεμοσκεπτέες$  which Thetis packed in her boy's box for Troy, Π 224, were surely similar garments. It contained  $\tauάπητες$  too, and it is one of these rugs or heavy plaids that Diomede has below his head, K 156.

Dr. Leaf's remark that Odysseus is made to take only a shield, to give opportunity for arming him afterwards, seems to have as little reason in it as that of Zoilus, that Odysseus was a coward to take no spear. The Mycenaean shield of full size was "almost an outer garment" (Monro on  $\xi$  479, quoting Reichel). We might also refer to such phrases as  $\deltaσπίδας ἐσσάμενοι$ , Ξ 371 f. Robert (p. 19) describes it as "a sort of garment," and quotes expressions in proof. When, however, one of these is applied to Odysseus in K 149, that does not, in Robert's view, shew that the shield in K was Mycenaean. No, as K is late, it was a round "Ionian shield," but worn in an exceptional manner. We are not convinced; the procedure is as doubtful as excising a passage or line which contradicts a theory. But as regards Dr. Leaf's remark, it is enough to observe that Nestor

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to note that in America and Africa a scout is called a wolf.—*Scouting for Boys*, 25 f.

told Odysseus little in 144 ff. Why then should Odysseus dress himself more than he did? Dr. Monro points out that it is taken for granted in § that Odysseus would have a *chiton*. So he would in K.

The lion-skins require separate notice. Dr. Leaf (*Introduction* to K) adopts Erhardt's suggestion (*Entstg.* 163 f.; and cf. Sittl., *Wiederhlygn.* 68) that they are borrowed from the late epic which glorified Hērakles. It was Pisander of Kameiros, in the second half of the 7th century B.C.,—but his *floruit* is uncertain (Jevons, 88, Mahaffy, 161),—who gave that hero his lion-skin and club. See Roscher, s.v. *Heracles*, and the references s.v. *Löwenfell* in the Index to Gruppe's *Griech. Mythol.* I suppose the discovery of an old vase might upset these disquisitions. And Erhardt finds it "strange" that "it is just in the Doloneia and only there"—once more no reference to the action of K—that this archaic costume is specially exploited. In *Preuss. Jahrb.* lxxii. 159, he regards it as an instance of *antikisirende Tendenz*. But the idea is, as Terret says (230 n.), devoid of all foundation.

We need not, we think, quote authority to prove that there were lions in Europe in very ancient times. Dagger-blades and intaglios shew they were hunted in Mycenaean days. The skins of the beasts killed would not be thrown away. In the rites of their lion-cult, Mycenaean worshippers wore lion-skins (*J.H.S.* xiv. 107). There was an ancient belief (*ibid.* 161) that there was virtue to the wearer from them, a belief that is found in India at the present day with regard to the tiger. But it is certain that the skins of beasts were used as clothing from the earliest times (Schrader, *Reallex.*, s.v. *Pelzkleider*, and Studniczka, *Beitr.* 71 f.). We do not require to refer to a vase found at Tiryns (Ludewig, *Schliemanns Ausgrabn.* 46). We know it abundantly from Homer, and we do not need Hērakles. It would, we think, be quite as reasonable to suggest that Diomede donned the lion-skin because he was a member of a Secret Society of Human Lions going out to get a Trojan's fat for his medicine, or to see in Shakespeare's "hang a calfskin" some reference to a development in bookbinding. A poor argument will do when it is desired to prove that a passage is late. Hērakles had no monopoly of the lion-skin. We do not even grant that the Hērakles saga did not know it and the club before Pisander's time. See Frazer, *Pausan.* iii. 611, quoting

Overbeck. The idea recalls Fick's argument, as stated by Gemoll (*Jb. Bursian*, 1888, 31), that because the first chariot-race at Olympia took place in B.C. 680, therefore the  $\delta\theta\lambda\alpha$  in  $\Psi$  had its origin after that date. But what's Hērakles to the Doloneia? Why should its author go to him for a lion-skin? And if, after borrowing it in his supposed irrepressible delight in strange dress, he could do no better than tell us in the baldest way that two men going out at night put it on their respective persons, he certainly deserves all the abuse that has been heaped upon him for his "want of inventive power." Pisander and his Hērakles do not suffice as substitutes for proof that lion-skins were not used as clothing in ancient times.

But it is not only the gear that is *in* the Doloneia that exercises the critics. The corslet is *not* there. But it is in late passages and books (except those of the *Odyssey*, for which see Robert, 31 *n.*) that this piece of armour appears. K is late, therefore K should know it. But it does not. What does its absence mean?<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Leaf's references to the point are in a note on K 77, in App. B, p. 577, and in *C.R.* ix. 55, reviewing Reichel. It is "curious," "significant," and "striking" that K does not mention the corslet, while it "revels in minute descriptions of every other sort of armour." Here again there is exaggeration. Greaves are not found in K at all; a regular metal helmet only once, in l. 30. No sword or spear or shield has more than bare mention. We are asked by Dr. Leaf to "note particularly" that Odysseus has not a corslet in K, and that next day in  $\Lambda$  he has one. But there is all the difference in the world between day and night work. This does not help us. Next Professor Murray (145 and *n.*, 154 *n.*) gives an explanation  $\delta\pi\acute{e}\rho\tau'$ , we humbly think,  $\ddot{\alpha}\rho\rho\eta\tau\sigma\dot{\nu}\ \ddot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\iota\nu\sigma\cdot$ . "Apparently the breastplate interpolations took place while K was still separate. When K was modified and inserted in the *Iliad*, the interest in the armour question had died down. Perhaps the old style of armour had been forgotten altogether." Not altogether. We remember, with Dr. Leaf, "the genuine Mykenaeian helmet" described so fully.

These speculations are not acceptable. But there appears to be no difficulty. That Odysseus and Diomede do not put on

<sup>1</sup> Robert, p. 21, will have it that the wording of K 254, 272 implies that Odysseus and Diomede put on corslets. I know of no other authority who thinks so.

corslets—and greaves and metal helmets—at night is, as already explained, quite intelligible. And see P. Hofmann's *Aristarchus stud. de cultu et victu heroum*, 56 n. That Nestor has not a corslet is, whatever the reason, at least consistent with the rest of the *Iliad* (Leaf, vol. i. 576). So no explanation is necessary. We think the poet of K may, in 77-9, mean us to understand that Nestor wore a  $\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\bar{\eta}\rho$  and no  $\theta\bar{\alpha}\rho\eta\xi$ . Perhaps a corslet was too cumbrous, possibly also too heavy, for a man of his great age. He was old and infirm, though still vigorous in spirit. He never kills his man or leads an attack (Seymour, *Life*, 88, and cf. A 250 ff., γ 245, Δ 321 ff., Θ 103, and Ψ 643-5).

The theories of Reichel that the corslet is due to late interpolations in a completed *Iliad* embodying Mycenaean culture, and of Robert that it is an index to purely Mycenaean, mixed Mycenaean and Ionian, and purely Ionian strata in a developing epos, have not gained acceptance. They depended on arbitrary excisions and on certain assumptions. Reichel lived to abandon an important element in his scheme, and Dr. Leaf rejects his theory as a whole. Sound criticism can have nothing to say to the excisions. Dr. Leaf (vol. ii. 630) characterises those in Robert's work in very plain terms. The assumptions employed are baseless. One is that if a warrior is not wearing a corslet, he belongs to a different period from the hero who does wear one. That requires us to believe, which we cannot do, that all the fighters at Troy wore a panoply of one type and composition. Secondly, if the corslet is not mentioned, a warrior is not wearing it. But that again is not to be conceded, even in such a "drastic" instance as M 427 ff., quoted by Robert, p. 31.  $\gamma\mu\mu\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\bar{\eta}$  may mean only "bared of the protection of his shield," as in M 389, II 312, 400. In other poetry, as Scott's and Tennyson's, reference to the corslet is often omitted, though we know a knight was wearing it. When Geraint spears a "bulky bandit," the corslet the robber was wearing may be mentioned, or it may not. Thirdly, with the Mycenaean shield a corslet was superfluous, and would not be worn. But that is going much too far. Such a shield was only a half, not a complete cylinder. Robert really yields the point when he says (p. 28) that it "protected either the front alone or the back alone."

But nothing requires to be added to Mr. Lang's discussion

of the matter in *H. and A.* chap. viii., and *Blackwood's Mag.* 1908, 81. See also Miss Stawell, 206 ff., and Professor Ridgeway in *Procgs. Class. Assocn. Scotl.* 1907-8, 49 f. It would be strange if the early epos did not know the corslet, for it seems to have been worn before the days of the *Iliad*. See Ostern, *Bewaffg.* 47 ff. In Mosso's *Palaces*, a warrior with cuirass and shield appears on the intaglio on p. 75, fig. 31 a. The Hagia Triada vase is reproduced on p. 167, fig. 75; see also Ostern, 68 ff. Whether the figures on it represent reapers or warriors, it seems certain that the leader wears "a full cuirass of mail," or an imitation of one. See also Schuchhardt, *Schliemann's Excavns.*, index, "Breastplate," and Mr. Lang in *Anthrop. and Class.* 57, 65 n. In *H. and A.* 161, he quotes Mr. Evans, a very high authority, for the use of the round shield and corslet in the earlier epic period, and against Reichel's expurgation of passages. The corslet even appears in the Cretan script (*Scrip. Min.* i. 42, 75 and n). It is unnecessary to say more.

If the absence of the corslet from K puzzles its enemies, they consider themselves more fortunate with the shields in it. They think they have proved that these are of the round, light, late, "Ionian" kind, and that kind is an armorial mark of inferiority for any passage. Dr. Leaf focuses the matter (vol. i. 575). First, Odysseus and Diomede ride carrying shields. Secondly, the company of Diomede sleep with their shields under their heads. Therefore the shields are light and round. For a different view see P. Hofmann's work already quoted, note on 52 f.

Dr. Leaf's conclusion seems hasty. Dr. Monro, as we have seen, takes Odysseus' shield as of the Mycenaean kind, and he believed the heroes rode. But we argue, pp. 274 ff. *infra*, that they drove, and we have good authority on our side. But even if we admit they rode, they might still carry big shields. See *H. and A.* 132, and the knight there figured. The kite-shaped shield of the Normans was, in its early days, of large size, but it was carried on horseback. Foot-soldiers carried the light round shield (Ashdown, *Brit. and Foreign Armour*, 77 f.). Geraint in Tennyson's *Idyll*, was laid wounded on a litter-bier, "all in the hollow of his shield," which he carried when mounted. The same is said of Siegfried in the *Nibelungenlied*, 1030. Again, the critics assume that all Mycenaean shields were huge

and heavy. Hence, they say, the chariot, to transport warriors about the field. But see *H. and A.* 116 ff. Mr. Lang has left not a shred of that theory. Dr. Leaf (vol. i. 573) refers to E 796 f., which seems to prove nothing,—it refers to a wounded man,—and II 106 (cf. N 710 f.), which is of Aias at the end of long and desperate fighting. And *his* shield was exceptional, H 220, 245, 266. There is proof in Λ 526 f. that it was bigger than others. Kebriones recognises him at once in the distance by it. See also Σ 192 f. And we know from the monuments that Mycenaean shields varied in shape. They no doubt also varied in material and weight. See Professor Burrows, *Discovs.* 207, and *C.R.* xxi. 20. Some were “figure of eight,” some cylindrical, some of conical section. They were also of different sizes. Mr. Myres protests (*C.R.* xvi. 73) against the assumption that no Mycenaean shield was circular. Warriors could ride with shields like those of two of the warriors in the siege fragment figured by Dr. Leaf, vol. i. 572. Miss Abrahams, (*Dress*, 6 f.) thinks they are not carrying shields. But we do not agree. It does not seem to be a garment in the case of the man on the right. Mr. Lang observes (*op. cit.* 132) that the artists of Mycenae represent men as using big shields when hunting lions. As that is “a sport in which speed of foot is desirable,” he concludes that we need not assume that such shields were always heavy. Because Hector’s shield covered him from nape to heel, Z 117 f., we need not infer that all shields were of that length. It should not surprise us to find great variety of armour in the *Iliad*. The armies were composed of contingents from many different parts of Europe and Asia (Ostern, 92 ff.). The ancient Germans, according to Tacitus, knew, in different parts of their territory, the round as well as the long rectangular shield (Petersdorff, *Germanen u. Griechen*, 13). We have seen that it was the same in Norman times.

Next, Diomede’s men sleep with their shields “under their heads,” K 152, as knights do in the *Lay of the last Minstrel*, or as Rustam does in the *Sháhnáma*. Therefore the shields are round, Dr. Leaf says, for the Mycenaean shield might “hardly serve as a pillow.” We do not admit the inference. The round shield cannot have been quite flat, and, if it was, a man would hardly use a plate to lay his head on. It had usually a central boss, to which the surface sloped up from the rim. It would not

make a good pillow. The chances with a Mycenaean shield would be much better. One could get a surface on it on which one's head would lie steady. There is an indentation at the middle in some specimens in which a head would repose quite comfortably. But a circular shield, mildly pyramidal, and probably with a smooth surface! It is possible, of course, that the poet conceived a cloth or garment as laid between the head and the surface. He certainly did so in Diomede's case (K 156, and see p. 93 *supra*). If that were so, most shields could be rendered suitable, and no inference is to be drawn either way.

But lastly, even if we concede that the shields are round, that does not prove lateness. Reichel's idea (p. 41) of Diomede as a regular Ionian hoplite, *ἱπποβάτης*, with his *ἱπποστρόφος*, is surely fanciful. Dr. Leaf himself admits (vol. i. 575 n.) that the Warrior Vase "shews that the round shield had come in by the end of the Mycenaean epoch," and that is early enough for our purpose. See also the Mycenaean *stelé* figured on p. 45 of Drerup's *Homer*. For shields of this shape in the Aegean area, see Burrows, *Discovs.*, *l.c.*, n. 3; Murray, 137 n.; Drerup, *op. cit.* 119; Hogarth, *Ionia and the East*, 73; Perrot and Chipiez, *Phoen. and Cypr.*, Eng. Transl., ii. 180; and *Encyclop. Bibl.* s.v. "Shield." I have seen it stated, but am unable to give a reference, that round shields have been found in "prehistoric layers" at Olympia. And see p. 195 *supra* (Lang's reference to Evans), to which add *Scrip. Min.* i. 25, 277. Ostern (p. 23) finds that round shields are general in the *Iliad*.

In conclusion we may here notice one other point. We have seen in Chap. XI. that the author of K has been charged with archaizing in language. There is also an "archaeological tendency notable in K" (Leaf, vol. i. 629). But all that I can find to support this is the following. First "the account of a genuine Mykenaean helmet" in K 261 ff. (*l.c.*). Next, the dressing of the heroes in the skins of wild animals (*Introd.* to K). The wild animals are enumerated, and include an ox and a bull. But enough has been said on this point. Thirdly, his note on K 215; the offer of the ewes is "probably . . . a touch of heroic simplicity." This also has been considered (pp. 185 f. *supra*). There remains the *κυνέη* to support this archaeological imputation. About that it seems sufficient to say that, if the author of K really had such a penchant, it is inexplicable how

he neglects to indulge it in regard to the shields, which Dr. Leaf and others say he makes quite modern. See Kluge in *Jahrb. k. P.* 1893, 91. Osterp (p. 29) assumes our author archaises, apparently because of the lion and panther skins. If the poet introduced skins and an old-time casque, and a στεφάνη which Robert tells us (p. 200) is the Mycenaean helmet, and refused corslets, all to maintain ancient colour, how is it that he did not make the shields correspond? How did he come to introduce the "Ionian" custom of riding? The archaeological tendency seems to have no evidence to support it.

On this point see *H. and A.* 266 f. Much of the argument in that work is directed to proving that poets in an early age do not archaise consciously; they describe the life of their own day and make their characters live in it. The proof is so good that the opposite belief may surely be regarded as a heresy that cannot be resuscitated. The weight of the opinion of other authorities seems to be to the same effect. Prof. Burrows (*Discovs.* 216), Dr. Evans (*Scrip. Min.* i. 61 n.), and Mr. Hall (*Oldest Civn. of Greece*, 223 f.) may be referred to. See also Gemoll on the *antikisierender Homer* in *Hom. Blät.* ii. 1 ff., and Rothe thereon in *Jb.* 1889, 367. (For other views see Cauer, *Grdfrgn.* 261; Drerup, 119; Harder, 241, and Finsler, 567, and cf. 476.) For early European poetry, see Ker, 15. Rothe rejects the *conventionelle Stilisierung* in life and manners which Wilamowitz finds characteristic of the Epos. Its pictures are "not artificially constructed, but adapted from a real experience" (Mahaffy, *Probs. in Greek Hist.* 50), "not a laboured mosaic or an archaeological revival" (Jebb, 37). See also Miss Abrahams, *Dress*, 16, and van Gennep, *Quest.* 33 f. For a criticism of the views of Dr. Leaf and Professor Murray, see Mr. Lang in *Blackwood's Mag.* 1908, 82 f., and in *Anthrop. and Class.* 46 f., and cf. 52. See also van Gennep (*Quest.* 11) on the *glaive à double tranchant* which cuts all knots. When the critics please, individual contributors to the poems preserve an old tradition faithfully; when they please, the poets introduce contemporary novelties. So the poems have no chance.

It seems difficult, on a careful review of the facts and of the opinions of the archaeological experts, to come to the conclusion that the armour and dress described in K contribute anything to the proof that the lay is not ancient.

## CHAPTER XXIV

### IS THE DOLONEIA A BURLESQUE?

A view of the Doloneia which may be said to be quite original has been stated by Professor Henry in *C.R.* xix. 192 ff. There is a criticism by Mr. Lang, *ibid.* 432 ff., and a rejoinder, xx. 97 ff. Professor Henry finds the author an incompetent blunderer, who is "miserable in his attempts to be Homeric." But there is more than incompetence. The Book is intentional comedy; its author is trying to be funny throughout. He succeeds only twice, apparently. He manages to "hit off" Nestor to perfection, and his picture of Dolon is "worthy of Shakespeare." But generally his attempts at humour are failures.

It is strange if this be so, because many writers who are, to use Professor Henry's language, "careful readers and ask questions as they read," have made the humorous element in the poems their special study,—Bischoff, Hess, Nestle, Butler, Hunt, and others. But none of them finds sustained comedy in K from beginning to end. The scholiasts give what Professor Henry terms "sleepy hints," and no more. Two high authorities, Monro and Jebb, find a less noble tone and something akin to comedy, but, as neither gives any particulars, their judgments cannot be criticised. This cannot, however, be said of Professor Henry's paper. He exposes a blunderer who is wooing the Comic Muse persistently, but who only succeeds in shocking his critic by his undignified capers.

But the critic seems to sweep the string somewhat boldly. His method is to examine the incidents and speeches in the lay, and to show how grotesque they are in themselves, how incongruous in their setting, and how alien to the Homeric spirit, as he himself conceives it. But it seems impossible to admit, in

most cases, that there is any straining after comic effect at all. In others, the slight touch of humour apparent seems to be exaggerated unreasonably. We do not find that the picture of Agamemnon's distress is intended to make him ridiculous. It is no stronger than others in like situations elsewhere (p. 154 *supra*). In describing the garments and equipment of the heroes on this almost unique occasion, the poet does not appear to be revelling in absurdity. Quite the contrary (pp. 190 f. *supra*). It seems an inaccurate translation to say that Nestor wakens Diomede "with a kick." Jahr alone (p. 3), as far as I can discover, agrees with Professor Henry here. He thinks Nestor's behaviour is rude, and such as "no one would bear with equanimity." The comment of Blass on such an appreciation of the scene has been quoted, p. 117 *supra*. We object to the descriptions when it is said that Diomede "flies at" Nestor, that the chiefs are "a motley crew," or that Odysseus moves off at the end of the story with a "guffaw" (*καγχαλόων*). Why not, as Leaf on Z 514 or Paley, *a.l.*, "laughing" or "smiling with satisfaction." We do not hear Nestor's voice "rising to a shriek" when Agamemnon approaches. There are no symptoms of fright in the old man; Agamemnon's reply to him does not indicate that he is in an ecstasy of terror. In all such cases we feel the poet's language is distorted to fit a theory. Again, we cannot see a "distinctly comic element" in the fact that Agamemnon and Menelaus both get up because they cannot sleep, or anything that can excite comment in "the cross purposes" which lead the Trojans to send out a spy when the Achaeans have done the same. These seem to be very ordinary expedients for the poet to adopt. This *Plankreuzung* has even been found interesting, not blameworthy (Jordan, *Erzählgsst.* 64). There had to be a Dolon to tell Odysseus and Diomede about the horses of Rhēsus. We can understand Agamemnon's charge to Menelaus without calling it impertinence (p. 153 *supra*). And we do not find "drivel in his best tragic style" in his lament to Nestor on the consequences of his folly and its punishment by Zeus. Mr. Lang (*H. and A.* 261) compares the cry of Charlemagne, *Deus! Si peneuse est ma vie.* The "homely English" for *οὐδέ τι σε χρὴ ἐστάμεναι μέλεον σὺν τεύχεσιν*, which is certainly not homely Greek, may be "there is no use standing there with your finger in your mouth." But a homely rendering could be found for

most sentences in Homer. See Butler's *Translations*. A homely version of H 109 f. (Agamemnon and Menelaus) would be "don't be a fool," and it would be a thoroughly bad one. "The airs of a great man" is a strange misdescription of Dolon's appeal for his life, or  $\delta\alpha\kappa\rho\nu\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  in 377 has no meaning. The critic seems altogether too hot in his mood. We have often seen the contributors to the epics held up as *Stümpers*, but never aught like this.

Parody of other passages in the poems is also charged against the author of K. The offers to accompany Diomede, 228 ff., are "evidently modelled" on Θ 91-174, a misprint, I think, for Θ 261 ff. or H 162 ff. Lines 266-71, the history of the  $\kappa\nu\nu\acute{e}\eta$ , are a "deliberate parody" of B 102 ff. The description of Dolon's bodily presence in 316 is a "deliberate parody" of E 801 of Tydeus. Nestor admires Rhēsus' horses, 550, in words that are a parody of those he uses in A 262. Line 556 is a parody of γ 231, because, apparently, the initial phrase is the same in each. But these are very extreme inferences, and are to be repudiated absolutely. The most that could be inferred is imitation. There is no ground for alleging parody, unless all imitation is held to be parody. In parody there is pleasantry at the expense of the passage travestied. But we do not admit that even imitation is proved. We must have some regard to the frequency of repetition in the epics. It is not enough to state an equation. Wilamowitz, for instance, who thinks Θ was composed in order to bring I and K into the *Iliad*, will not be disposed to admit that K has imitated Θ. The terms used of the casque recur not in B only, but also in H 149 and O 310. They are epic commonplace. And we must have regard to the poet's public. We have already argued (p. 189 *supra*) that they would probably love to hear the history of the casque, and to have its points carefully recounted. Mr. Lang (*Cornhill Mag.* 1908, 501 f.) quotes a very similar case from an Irish epic. That the casque, which Siecke (*Hermes d. Mondgott*, 49) considers "a characteristic emblem," was obtained by burglary is quite appropriate. Autolycus we know was a thief, τ 395 f. Had he figured as an honest man in K, the critics would have proclaimed spuriousness at once. Robert does remark (p. 501) that it is "weighty" that K does not appear to know Autolycus as Odysseus' grandfather. If it does not, then we must note that

that is one more argument against its "Odyssean" character. But as a matter of fact, nothing compels us to the belief that it does not. Another of Professor Henry's cases, οὐδὲ ἀλαοσκοπίνη, κ.τ.λ., 515, has been considered, p. 122 *supra*. Homeric formulae are not always applied quite appositely.

And we do not see how we are to stop at these passages. They are not the only places in which the poet of K may be accused of appropriating to his own use other parts of the poems. Take the prayers of Odysseus and Diomede at starting. We have had occasion to remark (p. 172 *supra*) on the similarity of the words they utter to those used by these same heroes at other junctures. Professor Henry's cold remark is "both pray for success in the approved manner." But he does not suggest parody. There is certainly no spirit of levity here. These supplications are surely as honest, as apt in expression, and as perfect in their simplicity as any in the poems. They may be placed beside Achilles' entreaty on behalf of Patroclus, or the despairing ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ δλεσσον of Aias. Odysseus' οὐδέ σε λήθω κινύμενος—"thou markest all my paths"—recalls the most beautiful of all such petitions, the one made to Apollo by Glaucus, δύνασαι δὲ σὺ πάντος ἀκούειν ἀνέρι κηδομένῳ.<sup>1</sup> The appeals in the Doloneia seem worthy of the *Iliad*. Professor Murray (p. 76) glories in "the beauty of those elements in the Saga in which the young hero is befriended and counselled by a mother or a guardian goddess. Think of . . . Odysseus and Athené." Yet there is as much in the wording of these prayers on which to argue parody as in the other cases which Professor Henry notices. But in fact, in the greater part of the Book there is nothing on which he can convict. It would be hard for the severest critic to find fault with the scene in the Trojan lines, the chase, the raid on the Thracians or the return to camp, so far at least as concerns what is called "genuine Homeric spirit."

The "burlesque" theory is, as Mr. Blakeney says (*Transln. of Il.* 275), "overdone." Humour there certainly is in the Doloneia, but just of the kind which, and no more than, we find in other parts of the poems. We cannot see that its author is *praeter solitum levius*. He mingles gay with grave here as elsewhere. *Idem jucundus et gravis* was Quintilian's judgment.

<sup>1</sup> Which seems, if any adverse quotation be required, to dispose of Leaf's note that the expression in the Doloneia

contains a view of the gods that is "hardly Homeric."

Who is to blame the poet? He wrought on the laughter as well as the tears of his audience (Mülder, *Quellen*, 343). Mure (i. 395 f., 400) and others have not found any offence against poetical propriety. Shakespeare wrote Tragi-comedies. The epic is a complex (Ker, 16). The grand style is not "a panoply which the wearer should never take off" (Professor Saintsbury to the English Association, Jany. 1910). In Vergil's imitation of the Doloneia in *Aen.* ix., one man is killed snoring in bed and another is caught hiding behind the big liquor-bowl. The incidents are not scoffed at, though they are alien to the generally severe spirit of the Latin epic. We need not be surprised at the good-natured brush between light-hearted old Nestor and Diomede. There generally is a slight atmosphere of humour about Nestor's interventions in the *Iliad* (Bréal, 108, and see *H. and A.* chap. xiv.). Dissectors, in their eagerness to get the son of Neleus out of the poems, are too apt to regard him as "a tedious old fool," like Polonius, and nothing more. There is humour in the smile with which Odysseus receives Dolon's account of the splendid bribe that had proved his undoing. The idea of such a weakling driving Achilles' immortal team was, and excusably, too much for the Achaeans' gravity. There is humour of the grimmest, most thoroughly Iliadic, when Diomede tells Dolon he thinks he must take the precaution of obviating the possibility of any future spying. It is even possible to see with Fries,<sup>1</sup> quoted by Professor Henry, a sort of "comic motive" in our story. The *Peripeteia* may easily take on that aspect. But Fries does not say he finds comedy in every other incident of a lay that is full of life. The tone of the narrative respects the epic dignity throughout. The subject is of a very special nature. The poet has to describe some things and doings which are in a way trivial, and which hardly fall to be dealt with in other books. But we believe it is only bare justice to him to say that he never fails *proprie communia dicere*.

In his rejoinder to Mr. Lang's criticism the Professor admits that his view of K is influenced by "the very low date to which it must be assigned." But, though we do not question his general statement, we must bear in mind that they are hardly in the majority who bring the date as low as 650 or 600 B.C.

<sup>1</sup> In *Griech.-oriental. Untersuchgn.* 233 ff.—It is interesting to note that Fries finds a close parallel to the Doloneia in the 10th book of the *Mahābhārata*.

We have seen that many critics of repute admit a respectable antiquity, and we hope we have shewn they are right. That being so, we must share Mr. Lang's wonder how such a "conscious mockery" could win its way into the canon. Professor Henry points to the Hymn to Hermes, but the parallel is not convincing. The Hymns were compositions of an inferior grade; they were not admitted to the Homeric canon (*C.R.* xix. 117). Its solidarity and sanctity were too great. And there is burlesque in the Hymn to the god of rogues (*ibid.*). The Hymn itself bears witness (S. and A. 129). There is an obviously "cynical and quasi-parodic" style throughout (*ibid.* 134). We find that style nowhere in Homer. Dr. Monro (*Odyssey*, 331) finds in the *Odyssey* parody of a few expressions in the *Iliad*. It is very difficult to accept his proof, when one looks into individual instances. I hope to have before long an opportunity of discussing them as a whole.

One other point taken by Professor Henry has been noticed by other critics,—the proverbs and proverbial sayings in the lay. He instances those in 173 and 224, and appears to take them as symptomatic of the realism which is characteristic of the *Odyssey*. But the difference in tone between the two epics which Immisch, whom he quotes, thinks he detects, requires no more explanation than is to be found in difference of subject. To those who find no degradation of the epic and do not find a more "biotic" tendency or more *Individualismus* in the *Odyssey*, or who decline to believe that Ω is the work of a late Ionian, Immisch does not appeal. Proverbs are not in themselves a striking phenomenon. They are found elsewhere in the *Iliad*, P 32 = T 198, I 256, etc. See Finsler, 505. And we do not know that *sententiae* of the kind were proverbs.<sup>1</sup> They were proverbial, or some of them were, in later times, no doubt. But they may, like many of the phrases and *mots* of Vergil, Horace, Shakespeare, Pope and others, have become proverbs only after the author's day. Like Shakespeare, Homer is "full of quotations." See Tolkiehn, *De Homeri auctoritate*, etc., 248 ff., and the reference to Macrobius.

<sup>1</sup> Except in rare instances. We can-  
not doubt that ἀπὸ δρυὸς οὐδὲ ἀπὸ πέτρης,  
τ. 163, was a saying in common use.

Nothing forbids us to believe that  
ρέχθεν δέ τε νήπιος ζγνω is original in  
Homer.

## CHAPTER XXV

### HOW IS IT WITH THE *MĒNIS*?

THERE is one very good reason why we should hesitate to accept the results of the hostile criticism of K, and that is, that if we apply its methods to A, we find in the latter linguistic peculiarities and other infirmities, of the same kind and as numerous as those which have been detected in K. If one is to discredit K on the shewing of Dissectors, and to hold that it is later than the rest of the *Iliad* and only fit to be fathered on the compilers of the *Odyssey*, we must come to the same conclusion regarding the opening scene of the *Mēnis* itself. A is very kernel. Let us see what it yields when treated as K has been, assuming for the time the rôle of Dissector and his attitude towards K, and arming ourselves with his methods, canons, beliefs, assumptions and general apparatus. If his peculiarities and irregularities and difficulties prove lateness, we shall be constrained to say that A cannot possibly be early.

In App. J the linguistic peculiarities of A are catalogued on the model of Orszulik's list for K. The one enumeration seems to be about as serious as the other. That for A is a mere rough enumeration. It would no doubt have been of much more formidable dimensions, if the critics had become imbued, three-quarters of a century ago, with the notion that A was late, and had attacked it with the fervour which they have displayed against K.

These peculiarities prove that A is late. But we can go a step further. Its close connection with the *Odyssey* can be established beyond all question. See App. K, in which an enumeration is given of all the words, phrases, etc., in A, which reappear only in the *Odyssey* and the Odyssean parts of the

*Iliad*,—I, K, Ψ, Ω, with Σ, Nestor's story in Α, the *Boiotia* and the *Apate*. Α and these parts of the *Iliad* are shewn to constitute with the *Odyssey* a homogeneous Odyssean mass.

And if we extend our enquiry beyond the language, the Odyssean case against the Book can be made even stronger. Take, for instance, Principal Geddes' "criterion of honour to Odysseus" (*Problem*, chap. x.), for which see p. 164 *supra*. He admits (p. 93) that in A Odysseus is mentioned respectfully, and "as a famous mariner" is charged with an important function. Odysseus in A is the Odysseus of the *Odyssey*. This indicates that A is "Ulyssean." Again, according to Dissecting belief, Olympus is a mere mountain in the *Iliad*; in the *Odyssey* it is an ideal site in empyreal regions, where the blessed gods live "in quiet seats above the thunder." A agrees with the Odyssean conception; Olympus is not a mere mountain. Hephaestus, flung from it by his unnatural father, takes a whole day to reach the earth. "From morn To noon he fell, from noon to dewy eve, A summer's day." Had the fall been only from the top of Mount Olympus, he must have reached Lemnos after a hardly appreciable interval. How different in T 131, for instance! Até, similarly treated by Zeus, τάχα ἵκετο ἐργ' ἀνθρώπων, as we should expect. Another point is the mention of the Sintians, who reappear only in the Lay in θ, the most disreputable of all the productions of Odyssean decadence. Yet another is the mention of the Aethiopians. They are referred to again only in Ψ and the *Odyssey*. Other *geographica* might be specified as tending to the same conclusion. Perhaps the most important of all is the intimate knowledge which the author of A exhibits of the coasts and hinterland of Asia Minor. This, as readers of Dr. Leaf's *Iliad* know, is a sure sign of lateness, and one that is common in the *Odyssey*. And again, the conception of the gods. It will be observed, later on in this chapter, that they are degraded from the high status conferred on them by the poets of the hey-day of epic composition. In A there is the *multo minor majestas deorum* which van Nes (*De Hom. Quaestt.* 36) finds in the *Odyssey* as compared with the best parts of the *Iliad*. Yet another point of similarity is the scarcity of similes. Mure (i. 260) observes that A has not one,—there are small ones in 47, 104, and 359 (?),—and that Ω (which is Odyssean) comes nearest to it in this respect among the books of the *Iliad*. The *Odyssey* also has few (p. 39

*supra*). It is an indication of the poverty of genius which marked the decadence of the epic. The Hymns and Hesiod's works exhibit the same defect. In the period known to Dissectors, though they do not define it accurately, as the bloom of the epic, Professor Murray (p. 215) tells us there was a common stock of similes, "ready-made," to which the bards had access. They could appropriate them and sprinkle their compositions with them at will,—though, strangely enough, similes are seldom repeated in the two poems. But when the epic ceased to blossom, this reserve of figures must have been lost or dispersed, and the decadent authors were thrown on their own resources.

*οὐδέ τι που ἥδειν ξυνῆια κείμενα πολλά.*

But we propose, always arguing on Dissecting lines, to extend the attack on A still further, and to prove that its author was a poor artist, like the poet of K. The general style is "noticeably mannered" (*Leaf, Introduction to K.*, p. 423). First, there is the "effort to produce striking contrasts," which Dr. Leaf (*ibid.* 424) finds in K, and Jebb (p. 162) in I and Ω. Mr. Lang asks (*H. and E.* 146) what artist does not produce effects by contrasts, and other authorities support him, as Mure (ii. 47 f.), Roemer (see *Jb.* 1903, 303), and E. H. Meyer (*Hom. u. d. Il.* 49), but we need not regard their views. We note instances in A. The horrible brutality of Agamemnon—see especially 29-31—is contrasted with the good feeling shewn by the camp generally to the suppliant priest. The calm and general pleasantness of the voyage to Chrysé, and the atonement to the god, are in pleasant (and, some think, skilful) contrast to the *Sturm und Drang* of the wrangle in the *Agora*. Even in Heaven itself we have a quick change from the scene in which satisfaction is given to Thetis, and confirmed by a nod that makes Olympus reel, to a scene between the Father of Gods and Men and his spouse which "would be discreditable to their humblest worshippers on earth" (Mure, i. 485 f.). Then, yet another change to the closing burlesque, one of a few incidents in the poems which "the wits of later centuries" could not improve on (Cauer, *Grdfrgn.* 345). All is buffoonery; the "rulers of the world" are merrymaking. The place that elsewhere *πότνια "Hβη* fills in their solemn assemblies is taken by a hirpling blacksmith. Apollo, who opens the book as the Angel of Death, closes it playing to the feasters. It is tragedy followed by farce. The Doloneia is "mellow music

match'd with this." But as in K, it is all "at the expense of the harmony and repose of the epic style" (Leaf, *l.c.*).

Next we mark the tedious diffuseness which the critics blame in K. That is not the way of "the old *epos*." "The *Ur-Ilias* is characterised by brevity" (Robert, 88, 105). The Quarrel Scene, like the prologue to the Doloneia, is unduly spun out. The reason is clear on a hint from Jebb (p. 161) as to the origin of I. The poet, "conscious," like the author of that book and Ω, "especially of rhetorical gifts," indulged his talent too freely. We tire of the recriminations; the half were better than the whole. To make matters worse, the scene includes that certain mark of modernity, an uninteresting reminiscence of Nestor's young days. The compiler of A is using the "Pylian Epos," or "grafting a distinct epic ballad" (Leaf on I 523). Worst of all, we miss lucidity of thought. The want of clearness noted, some have thought hypercritically, in K, is as moonlight to sunlight when compared with the ambiguities and obscurities of A. See Bernhardy (p. 157) for blemishes of the kind *in die tadellose Mēnis*. We are never told that Apollo stays the plague, unless by the vague reference in 457. The omission is "a small detail, but not quite like the usual epic style" (Leaf on N 256). Oldfather (*Lokrika*, 464) observes that the information about Chrysé, Chryses and Chryseis is very vague. For instance, at one point Chryses is left praying in the camp. He is next heard of at his home. How he got there is not stated. This is "more than is usually left unexpressed" (Leaf on I 552). Not many expressions in the poems have proved so troublesome as that intractable *ἐκ τοῦ* in 493. The reference in the very proem to the "counsel of Zeus" is almost as difficult, not to mention the obvious allusion to the *Cypria*. We can translate 133 in three ways. "The connection of thought" is sometimes not clear, as 282 ff., or "there is a mixture of two trains of thought," as 352 ff. See Dr. Leaf's notes on these passages and on *ἔμον* in 526. Such *ἀσάφεια* is not what we expect from the *Ur-Ilias*. Other peculiarities of style have been noted. The poet has a fondness for asyndeton and ellipsis, and indulges in a "specially harsh" zeugma in 533. He thinks it effective to repeat a word time after time in consecutive lines, as 287 ff. and 436 ff. On the last, Christ (*Interpol.* 185 f.) remarks with truth that "only a duffer" could shew such want of taste. The *Idylls*

of the King, it may be observed, and some of Shakespeare's plays exhibit the same cheap striving after effect. Our bard also takes pleasure in coining far-fetched and clumsy phrases, such as *χόλον καταπέψη, ἀφενος καὶ πλούτον ἀφύξειν, αἰνὰ τεκοῦσα, κῆρ εἴδεται εἶναι*. He has a liking for gnomic or quasi-gnomic deliverances, as in 80, 218, 278 f.

There are some intolerable hyperboles. The Giant with a hundred hands does not reappear in the poems, and there is not a monster in them to compare with him, not even Scylla. He is Hesiodic. If Professor Bury's suggestion (*Hist. Gr.* 109) that he symbolises a great advance in shipbuilding in the Aegean area, and is "no other than the new racer of the seas sped by a hundred hands," have anything in it, he may yet help us to date the *Mēnis*, as the lion-skin helps Erhardt and Leaf with the Doloneia. We have in A the most extraordinary theophany of the poems,—a god on earth for nine days massacring the Achaeans and their animals. But we do not hear that their numbers were diminished. We marvel that one, even one, was left. The famous fall of Hephaestus has been mentioned above. Here we may add that a bard of the bloom would never have represented the victim as recalling it in the presence of its brutal perpetrator. Late poetasters, as Dissectors know well, constantly betray themselves by such outrages on propriety. *Nihil quod tetigerunt non inquinaverunt*. A has not the repose that stamps the work of the old and genuine bards. Its author is, like his brother of K (Monro, *Introd.* to K, and Jebb, 123, 156), out of touch with "the tragic elevation of the *Iliad*." The Billingsgate in the Assembly can be paralleled only in other "late" parts,—B (Thersites), Ψ 473-87, N 769 = Γ 39, and the *Odyssey* (Irus, Melanthius and the drunken Wooers). Λ 385 (Diomedē to Paris), an imitation of Hector's abuse of the same hero, is in a passage "that has been suspected" by E. H. Meyer, so it does not count. In A, Agamemnon and Achilles "use language which could scarcely be endured towards servants on the stage" (Coleridge, *Greek Classic Poets*,<sup>2</sup> 75, quoting Vico). It is not in the best style to represent a god as coming clattering down a mountain side, and sitting down to shoot with a silver bow at—mules and dogs! The scene in Olympus has already been referred to. Plato found it beneath the divine dignity. Very little of all in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* that has escaped the

Expurgator, is worse than Agamemnon's words to the father of Chryseüs in 31, or his reference to his own "wedded wife" in 113 f. High respect for women and the marriage bond is characteristic of the best lays. The hero in them is an ideal knight, "who loved one only and who clave to her."

Ordinary *Unebenheiten*, of the kind that has helped Dissection so much, are abundant. We might ask, with the ancients (Bywater's *Poetics*, 333), why the mules and dogs should be the first objects of Apollo's attention. Why not the horses and cattle? The honourable position thus accorded to dogs is a certain Odyssean note (Geddes, chap. xvi.). Mules are as certain a note of lateness. They reappear in B, K, Ψ, Ω and the *Odyssey*, and outside these only in two very "late" tracts in H and P. In A 469 f. more wine is provided for feasters, after they have put away the desire for eating and drinking (Bergk, 548 n.). It is easy to lay this at the door of a rhapsode; but the line is not "inorganic," and cannot be got rid of. Achilles takes it upon himself to summon the *Agora*, as in the generally suspicious book T. The poet only makes matters worse by explaining in 55 that Hera suggested this (Roemer, *Hom. Gestalten u. Gestaltungen*, 11 and 19). Had she no thought of the "unnumbered woes" she was bringing on the heads of her beloved Achaeans? And why allow them to be slaughtered for nine days without interfering? We do not wonder that Achilles takes a commanding place in military operations (*ὅπη ἀρξειεν Ἀχιλλεύς*, γ 106). But this is a very unseemly interference (Roemer, *l.c.*) with Agamemnon's prerogatives. Is it a sign of an age that is becoming democratic? Cf. Hirzel, *Themis, Dike, etc.*, 237 f. The author of A seems to have a grudge against the Generalissimo, and to desire to shew him in as unpleasant a light as possible. Girard (*Rev. d. Études Grecques*, 1902, 233) argues that there was *une conception d'Iliade qui faisait d'Achille le principal personnage du poème*. Indeed there is a new view of the kingship in A (Finsler, 383). In the Assembly Kalchas is much too forward. He seems anxious to get a word in, and to precipitate matters, before any one else can be selected to explain. The absurdity of the apparition of Athené requires only to be recalled. All present are reduced to the condition of *εἰδωλα*,—cf. schol. on Λ 767,—while Achilles and the goddess hold their conversation. It is most "un-Homeric" procedure. The same

may be said of the collection and distribution of booty. Cauer (*Grdfrgn.* 528) approves Mülder's suggestion that this is a sign of the late origin of the book. It seems doubtful if Athené was known to the *Ur-Ilias*. We have commented on her appearance in A. In X her interposition is so mean as to be absolutely intolerable. In Α she is mentioned only in Nestor's tale, which is "late." Her appearances in what are considered the books of the *Kern* are no doubt due to Athenian influence. That the interpolators bungled the insertions is nothing strange. And Athené is not the only deity in the *Mēnis* who takes us by surprise. Her brother Apollo's proceedings have been noticed above. And consider Father Zeus as he is exhibited to us, a puny godhead that requires a giant as bodyguard. Compare him with the Zeus we know elsewhere, Hesiod's conqueror of the Titans; *non viget quidquam simile aut secundum*. We could point out other blots on the theogony of the Book. Again, the fall of Hephaestus is from a mountain or heaven of unimaginable loftiness, an eminence to "make Ossa like a wart." Yet in 532 Thetis takes the intervening space in her stride, so to speak. This is not consistent (Erhardt, *Entstg.* 9). The two views of Olympus differ *toto coelo*. There is a glaring discrepancy between A and another part of the *Iliad*. In B 378 Agamemnon says, referring to the great Quarrel, ἐγὼ δ' ἡρχον χαλεπαίνων. And this is the view usually taken. As Miss Stawell puts it, *H. and Il.* 13, "Agamemnon is obviously in the wrong." Perhaps. But did not the first taunt, the little spark that lit the conflagration, come from Achilles? What could be more gratuitous than the close of his reply to Kalchas, 90 f.? Have we not here the amalgamation of two "parallel versions," of the kind that Dr. Leaf detects here and there in the *Iliad*? The plural in ἀφέλεσθε, 299, may have a similar explanation. But enough. It is easy, when armed with the plenary powers that Dissectors arrogate to themselves, to discredit and break up the *Mēnis*.

One other note of lateness requires special mention. There is the "archaeological tendency" that Dr. Leaf detects in K. Unfortunately there is no fighting in A, so we have no blunders as to armour. But there are other archaic traces, in religious matters especially. The *στέμμα* is one. We nowhere else hear of it as part of priestly insignia. We nowhere else hear Apollo addressed by the very archaic and unintelligible title of Σμινθεύς.

We nowhere outside A, except in the opening of E, which the critics suspect, read of a priest who is “a professional ‘cursing-man’ like Balaam” (Murray, 150). The professional interpreter of dreams also reappears only in E 149. The old legends of War in Heaven, of Briareus, and of that absurd tumble of Hephaestus, all tell the same tale. In two cases the author is most evidently trying to introduce what Dr. Leaf on K 215 calls “a touch of heroic simplicity.” The famous *σκῆπτρον*, the descent of which is described in terms obviously borrowed from the account of the *κυνέη* in K, is a mere bit of stick. It is true this staff is said in 246 to be *χρυσεῖος ἥλοισι πεπαρμένον*. But that line is “inorganic.” It “can be cut out.” The description is taken from A 633. The remainder of the line, *ἔξετο δ' αὐτός*, is due to a *Stümper* who thought he had detected an omission. In 39, *εἴ ποτέ τοι χαρίεντ' ἐπὶ νηὸν ἔρεψα*, we have the same tendency. This is explained by Dr. Leaf, *a.l.*, as indicating “the most primitive form of temple—a mere roof to protect the image of a god standing in a grove.” And correctly; such shrines in the making may be seen frequently in the India of to-day. The archaising poet would lead us back to times that are but one stage more modern than those in which the tree itself is the habitation of the god (Kern, *Anfänge d. hellen. Relig.* 13). Wecklein (*Studien*, 50) sees more in the verse. The word *νηὸς* proves that the Achilleis belongs to the modern Ionic period. Cf. Cauer, *Grdfrgn.* 303 f. The author’s cloven hoof peeps out. *Mendacem memorem esse oportet.*

The question of interpolation I have not space to treat in detail. Many attempts have been made to prove late intrusions, notably the *Chryseid* and the closing scene, the feast of the gods. They have all been failures. The general opinion is that in A we have a piece of uncontaminated poetry, which confirms our conclusion that it is of late origin. It came into being, like K, at a time when the interpolators were ceasing from troubling (pp. 19 f. *supra*).

If then any weight is to be given to eccentricities of diction, style and contents, and if Dissectors’ methods are good, it is certain that A was composed by one of the bards who flourished after the close of the golden age of the epic. He betrays himself by his every movement. His symptoms of distress, *φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσι*, are those always exhibited by the *Flick-Poet* as he

staggers under the too vast task he has taken on himself. They are born of sheer incapacity. And all these years critics and poets alike, with their eyes holden, have been lauding this poor lay as a genuine product of supreme genius. It seems to need only a critic endowed with the necessary keenness of scent for the abnormal to disprove all that, and φόως τεύχειν ἔταροισι. As surely as the critics have proved the Doloneia to be an addition, a senseless addition, to the *Iliad* by some inferior scribbler, so surely will they yet destroy our simple, ancient faith in the Μῆνις ἀμύμων. The villainy they have learnt so well they will execute on it, and then down topples the whole of the “Poetry about Troy,” *disjecta non leni ruina*.

*Ridentem dicere verum NIL vetat.* But in all seriousness we ask how A can be held to be old and genuine, if K is, on the evidence against it, to be condemned as modern and spurious and Odyssean. Once get rid of the current superstition that A is ancient, and it can be overthrown—by popular methods—as easily as K has been. We have seen, pp. 32 f. *supra*, that some Neo-Homerists are already in revolt. Further developments will be awaited with interest, for it seems likely that the last plight of Dissection will be worse than the first, when Lachmann and Köchly tried their prentice hands on the poems. Meantime we are content that K stands or falls with A.

## CHAPTER XXVI

### CONCLUSION

AT every point the case against the Doloneia seems to fail when tested. We have found nothing in the position of the lay in the *Iliad*, in its relation to the other books in that poem, or in the "difficulties" which have been found in it, to indicate that it is late. The same may be said of its language. However we test it, we find evidence of affinity with the rest of the poem, but distinct differences between it and the linguistic and metrical usages of the Cyclicks, the Hymns and Hesiod. The lay is not more "Odyssean" than the earliest part of the *Ur-Ilias*. There are parts of the *Iliad* which are more "Odyssean" than others, but the explanation is not that these are later. The differences in language alleged between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have dwindled on inspection to very small dimensions. The language of the two poems may be considered one, and the poems themselves of the same age.

The Doloneia appears to be as old as the original *Iliad* of the critics. We think the differences between it and the rest of the poem are so slight, and the correspondence so marked and so significant, that it would not be rash to affirm that it is by the same author as the rest of the books. But we are content to say that the critics have failed to prove that it is of a later date than these.

One objection is sure to be made, and may be anticipated at once. We shall be told that where there is smoke, there is fire. Is it possible, it will be asked, that so much could be said against the Doloneia, if it were really as ancient and as genuine as the *Ur-Ilias*? It is quite possible to produce much smoke from very little fire, if a sufficient quantity of fuel of a certain kind be piled on; and the bulk and character of the case

heaped up against our lay need not surprise us, if we but remember the temper in which the majority of its critics have approached it. "Disinterested endeavour" is conspicuous by its absence. Most of them have come to the test, not in order to find out whether the lay is late or early, but with the conviction that it is late, and only desirous of adding to the proof. Their work is coloured by what has been described in other critics as "a sort of personal partisanship or antipathy," and which is anything but an aid to fair criticism. We need not wonder that a mass of the objections which are the outcome of enquiry undertaken by Dissectors in such a spirit, are found to be trivial and to disappear at once on examination. Their mere volume is not to be regarded. What is alone of importance is the residue that can with justice be placed against the credit of the lay. And that is no greater than the same for the first book of the *Iliad*. Its bulk has been greatly increased by the disinclination or inability of objectors to disregard modern conditions, and to place themselves at an ancient standpoint.

That there are parts of the *Iliad* which have been proved to be later than others, is, as already said, the basis of all the popular theories of its origin. We humbly think that the Odyssean theory must be rejected, and that four books, not to mention minor tracts, are restored to the age of the *Ur-Ilias*. The rest of the *Iliad*, that is, the books other than those of the *Ur-Ilias* and the parts which are styled Odyssean, is composed, roughly, of Dr. Leaf's First and Second Expansions. Now as against these, opinion is far from strong. Many high authorities who think they are additions to the *Ur-Ilias*, are ready to admit that they may be from the hand of the author of the kernel. There is little in them on which an origin more modern than that of the *Mēnis* can be argued. We have even seen that a new school holds that they are more ancient than the *Mēnis*; and personally we cherish a strong belief that, to complete the proof of the antiquity and homogeneity of the *Iliad* as a whole, it is only necessary to subject the tracts between the *Ur-Ilias* and the Odyssean area to an examination such as we have applied to the Doloneia. No doubt when such a defence of these parts of the poem is undertaken, points will emerge which we have not had to deal with. But the greater part of the proof will be on identical lines. The principles, assumptions and accepted

beliefs on which Dissecting Criticism proceeds, are now a stereotyped, invariable system. We have had to discuss most of them in the course of our investigations, and we propose, before leaving them, to bring them together in one conspectus here. When we add to them the postulated *Ordner*, Interpolator, Worker-over, Expurgator and Archaiser, we may ask if such an apparatus has ever, in the history of criticism, been at the command of critics bent on discrediting a body of poetry. And we believe the answer must be that criticism in any age has not anything to shew so unfair.

To begin with peculiarities of language. They are often held to prove a line or a passage late, without any further explanation, without any attempt to date the word or usage, and in spite of the fact that exceptional usages are everywhere in Homer. As they are certain evidence of lateness, an obvious resource for the defence is to attempt to shew that the total of significant peculiarity is no greater than in some acceptable book of the poems. But our proof will be useless. We are anticipated by the explanation that many of the late manipulators of the epics had an accurate sense of the old epic language. α. λλ. being marks of spuriousness, we may shew that our lay contains comparatively few. But the adversary replies that our bard was late, and, being late, of course borrowed extensively from others. Consequently he did not allow himself sufficient scope for the use of the rare words which would have betrayed him. Similarly, if we try his work by some grammatical test favoured by Dissectors,—if, for instance, we shew that he is far from vicious in his uses of the Article, we are told again that the inference that he was as early as the authors of blameless tracts is not justified. There is another vice of lateness, proneness to imitation, and he, being late, imitated the style and language of his predecessors and betters, and so avoided the solecisms which his composition would otherwise have exhibited. And being late, he is to have no mercy shewn him. If he uses a rare word, there is a protest; if he uses a common one a number of times, it is noted against him, and tends in some mysterious way to shew that the initial assumption that he was late is correct. If he gives detail, he is objectionably diffuse; if he is succinct and refrains from giving superfluous information, such a failure in his duty to modern readers is fatal to his

character. The standard by which his merits and his vices are measured is the *Ur-Ilias*. His defenders are not to appeal to the later and weaker parts of the epics, but Dissectors themselves may appeal to these freely, when necessary. It would seem to render examination of the language nugatory. Dissectors "sport with their own deceptions" in a way to dumbfound the opposition. It is much the same with interpolations. If we shew there are none, or very few and those trifling, in the Doloneia, that is a symptom of lateness, inasmuch as, in its late age, interpolation had ceased. If we point to a similar freedom from spurious passages in parts of the *Ur-Ilias*, we are told that these parts are of course early, and have certainly suffered, but that the hand of kindly Time has smoothed all over, so that no inequality is now perceptible to indicate the intrusions which have undoubtedly taken place. The Doloneia, being late, cannot have suffered thus. Yet it is admitted that there were interpolators of high inspiration and genius even to the latest days of the bloom of the epic, and some of the leaders of Dissection even shew that the poems were added to centuries afterwards, as by Cynaethus at Syracuse. And it will be of no avail for us to point to our adversaries' admission that other parts of the poems were interpolated *from* our lay, though it was itself so late that nothing could be inserted *in* it. The Doloneia is late, "and there's an end on't." Düntzer established that fact by shewing that the lay uses some words that recur only in the *Odyssey* and a few that do not recur at all, and that it is soiled by faults that the bards of the bloom of the epic never committed. Their language and style were perfect. *τοῦτο γέρας βασιλῆϊον ἔσχον.* But when we apply to the lays of these early authors the tests approved by modern philology, we find they stand the trial no better than the late and inferior cantos.

The procedure of Homeric critics in the detection of interpolations has been characterised in Chap. III. They postulate a state of things that is without a parallel. They assume that there was perfect freedom for any one to add to or to subtract from the poems, though from the earliest date these were regarded with a loving veneration which has seldom, if ever, been equalled in the history of national literatures. And any one manipulating the poems might alter their text as he found it, in order to make a new addition suitable or to conceal an excision. Irregularities

and inequalities could be removed by any one interested, and *were* removed. Yet contradictions which to Dissectors bear the gravest aspect, contradictions which they hold are absolutely subversive of unity and which they describe as "glaring" and "patent," were allowed to remain. Interpolations have been discovered in hundreds; some books have been chipped away till almost nothing of them is left. The process has become so easy. Almost any peculiarity is ground for suspicion. But even peculiarity is not essential; if lines are not to the taste of a critic, they may be rejected. If they can be cut out or are not indispensable, they are "inorganic" and may be abandoned to suit the purposes of the individual enquirer. "If a passage is not connected with some other, it is suspicious; if it refers to one, it is still more suspicious. If it contains a contradiction, the fraud is manifest; if it agrees with other matter, the imitation is clear as noonday. *Jeu sans règle . . . qui ne satisfait personne.*" These are the words of M. Bréal, reviewing (in *Journ. d. Sars.* 1903, 146), *not* one of the productions of the  $\pi\lambda\eta\theta\acute{\imath}\varsigma$  of Homeric criticism, but the *Studien zur Ilias* of Dr. Carl Robert, one of the leading classical scholars of Germany. See, to precisely the same effect, Calebow, *Il. lib. oct.* 50 f., and Wetzel, *De choriz. stud.* 6 ff. It is not writers of an inferior order alone who descend to such practices. They have become so ingrained in the Higher Criticism, that scholars of the highest standing in other spheres of classical research seem powerless to resist them, and do not seek to avoid them, when they come to deal with Homer. Here again one effect is to render discussion useless. Analogy or precedent cannot be appealed to; there is nothing to appeal to that has not been objected to by some authority in the long line that stretches from Zenodotus to Robert and Fick. But this is forgotten when the appeal has to be made by some member of the destructive school who is attacking a passage.

Then there are the Repetitions. The best of the Dissectors frankly admit that Repetition is a very patent characteristic of the epic style, but others seem to forget it entirely. It has come to this, that when two parallel passages are under discussion, the one which the critic wishes to prove the later is often assumed to be so, without reasons being given. It needs only to state the equation. "There is in the *Iliad* no lay that one

cannot by means of repetitions prove to be ancient or very modern, as one pleases" (Mülder, *Quellen*, 323 *n.*). Repeated matter may always be taken, and is taken even by the greatest scholars, as evidence of plagiarism, imitation or even parody. The epic commonplace is protected to some extent; it is generally allowed to stand without offence. But when in a passage a certain number of lines can be detected which occur elsewhere, then, be they commonplace or not, a late imitative poet may be proclaimed. We are asked to believe that the epic style was not difficult to imitate, and that "battle vignettes" and other episodes could be turned out with ease and decorated at will with "ready-made" similes, from a common stock that any one might draw on. The author of the Doloneia was one who borrowed freely; to some critics, indeed, he was no better than a mere cento-maker. This weakness proves that he was of the late imitative order. Yet his lateness is also argued from an independence which is the exact opposite of the vice described. For he can also be shewn to be late by his extraordinarily numerous departures, as in the matter of epithets, from genuine epic practice. But, though so far an innovator, he had at the same time an archaic and archaeological tendency. He imitated the archaic in his language. Yet no critic who has examined this weakness can make up his mind to as many as one case in a hundred lines of the lay. His "archaeological tendency" he displayed in a random fashion. On some points he imported ancient colour; on others he introduced the practices of his own day. The desire to discredit him o'erleaps itself, and the indictment under this head becomes confused and contradictory.

We complain too that the criticism of the lay has been in many respects unfair and one-sided. We have seen that its author's propensity for pilfering has had special attention. He is accused of plundering the *Odyssey*. But no one has enquired whether the parallelism on which the charge is based does not also extend to the *Iliad*. He is said to be Odyssean in his language; but no one has enquired if he be more so than the authors of genuine lays, or if there be words, expressions, and usages in his work which must, on the principles applied, be held to attach it to the *Iliad* and to separate it from the *Odyssey*. His Odyssean uses of prepositions are carefully enumerated; his

Iliadic uses are never mentioned. He descends to producing effects by contrasts; those who charge him thus do not stop to observe that the same thing can be said with even greater force of the *Mēnis* itself. See p. 207 *supra*, and Am.-H. *Einleitung* to A. A mass of lines and fragments of lines in his lay are shewn to occur elsewhere, and he is, on the mere number of these, held to be a cento-maker; but it is not stated that, on a similar enumeration, the same inference is permissible against the most ancient parts of the poems. His language is shewn to approximate to later Greek in various ways; but the most obvious and commonly applied test, the Digamma, is hardly mentioned. It is not asked by those who date him as late as 650 or even 600 B.C., whether modernisms which appear in works of poets of that period are found in his. The testing process has not been carried out consistently or completely. There is an obliquity of vision in the critics. At an early stage in modern Homeric criticism Colonel Mure exposed and condemned the "two-edged logic which nothing could resist," and the strange canons, of Heyne and Hermann. Inconsistency was held to be undeniable evidence of plurality of workers, in spite of all experience to the contrary. Repetition was to be allowed in only certain specified cases. And many a prejudice quite as irrational has since been allowed to develop into a critical principle. Gnomic lines must be rejected. Anything that can be spared must have been inserted in a late age. A thing mentioned only once must be suspected. If it is mentioned a second time, the repetition indicates an imitative poet, and so on.

The principles on which the fabric of the Higher Criticism has been constructed have not been elaborated with sufficient regard to common sense and fairness. Our lay is one of the most unfortunate of their victims. When we "separate facts from fancies" and correct obvious errors and excesses, there remains, we think, little to justify the disdain with which the critics regard the Lay of Dolon.

## APPENDIX A

### THE INTERPOLATIONS IN K

(1) Lines 5-16, the opening simile and the description of Agamemnon's distress. The former is "thoroughly bad" (Fick), "pointless and hopeless" (Leaf). See p. 184 *supra*. With 5-16 away, Fick thinks the formal verse, 17, follows well after 4. That is matter of taste. Even if we admit it, it proves nothing. Next, in ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀν δστράπτη, 5, ἀν can be replaced by κε. But that opens up a large question (Monro, *Odyssey*, 464, and *H.G.* 393; *Ench.* 559 ff., and Fick's works there referred to; Gemoll in *Jb. Bursian*, 1888, 29 and Naumann in *Jb.* 1895, 374), which we need not go into, as it is probable that neither ἀν nor κε is right here, and that we should read ὡς δὲ πύκ' (*Mnemos.* xx. 239 f.). ὅτ' ἀν is objected to as a modernism (*H.G.* 264, 329; Agar, 167, and Wecklein, *Textkrit.* 62). Lastly, the Article in πεδίον τὸ Τρωϊκόν points to a "later time." But later than what? If the lay dates from days when Attic uses of the Article had not yet been developed, it will be very early. And, to be consistent, Fick should not retain other passages containing such uses. He seems to hew the text for the advantage of the moment.

(2) 51 f. Superfluous (Fick, Leaf and others, following the Alexandrians). But pleonasm is frequent. There is little of it here, and what there is is *tautologia commoti* (Bothe). It is *un homme ému* that speaks (Pierron). We do not dock Agamemnon's speech in A 287-9, where, in a very bad temper, he repeats the same thing four times. δολιχόν = diu is a small matter. And if this be an interpolation, it must have been deliberate. What was the reason for it? None can be stated. Thoroughgoing Dissectors require none. *Sit pro ratione voluntas.*

(3) 57-9. Late, because they refer to I 9-88, which are late (Fick). That cannot be admitted (pp. 147 f. *supra*). And Fick does not cut out other references to the guards. Also the words are "too absurd" for Agamemnon to use. But see p. 153 *supra*. Fick has no objection to the language.

(4) 84. Agamemnon goes to Nestor. We cannot assume with Lehrs (*Ar.* 151 n.) that he enters his hut, for Nestor was sleeping in

the open. The old chief challenges Agamemnon, and asks why he is roaming about the camp at that hour. Then comes the question in 84, which to Fick is "very inappropriate." So Lehrs, and with some reason; for it would no doubt be absurd to ask a man inside one's hut if he were looking for a mule. Is then the question impossible? The authorities are divided. Pierron brackets. Stier thinks the enquiry natural. Dr. Leaf even finds "something peculiarly graphic," and quotes Schwartz' comparison of Xen. *Anab.* ii. 2, 20, where an ass causes a night alarm. This seems quite satisfying.

(5) 146 f. 147 has been "smuggled in" from 327 (Düntzer). Most editors agree. But this cannot be proved (Lange, *Jb.* 1880, 142). Pierron and Stier retain the line. But the ejectors can in this case suggest a motive. Some one thought, wrongly, that ἐπέοικε required an infin. But instead of supplying this in a suitable line, he took one (327) ready-made, the incongruity of which is glaring to modern critics. Dr. Leaf points out that "the question of fighting or flying" had been settled in I. But we cannot infer that Agamemnon, with his last hope dashed, has abandoned the idea of flight. He reverts to it next day, Ξ 74 ff. Nestor might well, then, if only to humour his chief, whose distress is greater than ever, use the words of 147, for he had not, in his speeches in I 53 ff. and 96 ff., directly negatived the proposal to fly, but only put it aside for the time.

(6) 202. Düntzer points to ἑδριώντο in 198, and pronounces 202 unnecessary. That may be, but such repetition is quite in the manner of the poems.

(7) 211-7. Fick rejects all seven lines, Nauck 213-7, Peppmüller (*Jahrb. k. P.* 1894, 34 f.) 214-6, Leaf in his first edition 214-7, and so on. Even Professor Jevons (p. 508) considers the passage one of a few in K that might be sacrificed.—First, ἡμέας is a late form (Fick, and Menrad, p. 107, quoting G. Meyer; and cf. *H.G.* 85). Now it occurs *Il.* 4, *Od.* 8. Menrad remarks that all these occurrences are in the *Odyssey* or late parts of the *Iliad*, except O 136, *ubi λείψει, δὸς ἡμίας ἐπειστὶ facile corrigas* for the vulgate *λείψει, δὸς ἡμέας εἰστι*. See also Bechtel in ΓΕΡΑΣ to A. Fick, 30. Note Menrad's method. The objectionable form may stand in passages which he considers late. In the early passage it must be amended. No doubt Meyer is right as to the form, but K 211 is entitled to the same treatment as O 136. *Facile corrigas* in it, *καὶ ἀψ εἰς ἡμίας ἀνέλθοι,* for *ἀψ ἀνέρχεσθαι* is thrice used in the poems = "return." If ἡμέας stands in O, it is good authority for K; if it must be amended in O, it can be in K also. Next, the neglect of *F* in 215, *τῶν πάντων οἱ Φέκαστος.* On this see p. 104 *supra*. The Digamma is sadly misapplied in Homeric criticism. What would Fick here? If the bulk of K was composed at a time when *F* was a living sound in Ionic, its age will be great. And Fick should be true to his principles and not allow other

neglects to stand. Compare what has been said about the Article, p. 221 *supra*. Tests should be applied consistently. In *Ench.* 143, there are some trenchant remarks on Fick's way with *F*.

*τῶν πάντων οἱ ἔκαστος* with a plur. verb is awkward (Leaf). The Leyden editors, however, quote θ 392 f. The construction is unusual, certainly. So are other laxities, such as the *σχῆμα Ἀλκμανικόν* (Leaf on E 774 and Y 138), and constructions *κατὰ σύνεσιν* generally. No particular kind is common, but there are instances and they have to be accepted. *φίλε τέκνον* does not surprise us. Dr. Leaf describes a case of the kind, Ψ 413, as "most natural"; in Π 264 f. Dr. Monroe (H.G. 159) sees "a slight boldness of expression." See also M. and R. on μ 181, Leaf on P 755 f., and Cauer, *Grdfrygn.* 390 ff. These cases are like Milton's "fairest of all her daughters, Eve," or Shakespeare's "more rawer," "most unkindest," "it is not, nor it cannot come to, good," and the like. See Raleigh, p. 225 and cf. 28. We must beware of too "dogmatic grammarians," who "make rules for language as Aristotle made rules for the epic poem, and impose their chill models on submissive decadence."

Nothing in all this advances the case for interpolation. Another point is the inducement held out by Nestor. On this see p. 185 *supra*. Fick says it is "simply absurd," but he uses much the same terms of the splendid simile in Π 384 ff., on which see Dr. Leaf.

(8) 228-32. Fick brackets. Better, he thinks, with MS. support, write  $\pi\acute{a}ntes$  for  $\pi\omega\lambdaoi$  in 227,—but that is the reading (of one MS.) only in 236,—and excise the five lines; for all except Idomeneus and Meges (and of course Nestor and Agamemnon) volunteer, and these two alone ought not to be marked as cowards. Then we ought to reject H 162 ff. and Θ 261 ff., where also Meges is overlooked. But this objection seems to be extreme, and has not been accepted. It may be added, as to the age of Idomeneus, that he was not young. See N 361, and cf. N 512 ff., which might have been written of Nestor. Meges is of the  $\kappa\acute{o}urjtes$  (*juvenes* or *principes*), T 193, 248.

(9) 237-40. Fick approves the athetesis of 240 by the Alexandrians, but gives no reason. But he also says 237-9 are impossible on account of *ἀπείω*. It seems extreme to sacrifice three whole lines on account of an uncontracted form in a fourth. It is well supported by *ἀμείνω*, *ἀπείοις*, etc. And see p. 233 *infra*, on contraction generally.

(10) 252 f. ἀστρα δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε, παρῷχωκεν δὲ πλέων νὺξ τῶν δύο μοιράων, τριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται. "This puzzling line (253) was rejected, presumably as unintelligible, by the Alexandrian trio" (Leaf). Fick and others approve. Pierron keeps both, as the condemnation of 253 is feeble; *Ulysse fait bien de préciser sa pensée*. . . . *C'est le cas de redondance*, διὰ τὸ περισσόν, which is a common feature of the poetry. See, e.g., Allen in *C.R.* xx. 268. The syntax of 253 has made a difficulty (Grossmann, *Homerica*, 26, and Leaf and Lawson, *a.l.*), which

Mr. Lawson solves by taking  $\pi\lambda\acute{e}\omega\nu$  as gen. plur. of  $\pi\lambda\acute{e}\oslash$ s agreeing with  $\mu\omega\rho\acute{a}\omega\nu$ , and translating "passed through two full watches."

Fick states objections to the language.  $\pi\lambda\acute{e}\omega\nu$  should be  $\pi\lambda\eta\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ . In his *Odyssey*, p. 19,  $\pi\lambda\acute{e}\omega\nu$ es appears to be good. And  $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$  is said to be a bad mistake for  $\tau\acute{a}\omega\nu$ . But Fick's "Ionic" tests have been strongly questioned. Cauer has shewn (*Jb.* 1884, 290 ff.) by detailed examination that he "has given to the terms 'Ionic' and 'Aeolic' an arbitrary and incorrect delimitation," and requires proof that forms which Fick calls Aeolic were not also old Ionic. See also Gemoll in *Jb. Bursian*, 1888, 30; *H.G.* 388 ff.; Jevons, 504, quoting authorities; and, for Fick's reply to Cauer and others, his *Ilias*, i. ff., and his recent *Entstg. d. Od.* 5 f. The critiques leave the impression that Fick and his followers have gone further than the remains of the dialects warrant.

As regards the particular question which interests us here, the epic form of the gen. plur. of the 1st decl., see especially *H.G.* 391 ff., where grounds are given for holding that the form in - $\epsilon\omega\nu$  cannot be definitely classed as only New Ionic. The genesis of the form and the period at which it originated have still to be explained. But in the present case we have the contracted form in - $\hat{\omega}\nu$ , which is a stage beyond - $\epsilon\omega\nu$ .  $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$  itself occurs in 5 other places (against  $\tau\acute{a}\omega\nu$  in 19), e.g. O 656, which is in what Christ regards as the old *Iliad*. (There van Leeuwen (*Ench.* 197) would read  $\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{a}\omega\nu$  for  $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu \pi\rho\omega\acute{e}\omega\nu$ ). But it may be suggested that in all such cases  $\tau\acute{e}\omega\nu$  was the original. It may have been modernised into  $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ . The presence of another  $\tau\acute{e}\omega\nu$  in the poems may have had something to do with the change. There must have been an intermediate form in - $\epsilon\omega\nu$  for the Article as for other words. At any rate the expedient seems no more objectionable than some of the amendments by which (*Ench. l.c.*) it is sought to restore the forms in - $\alpha\omega\nu$  throughout the *Ur-Ilias*.

And here again it seems pertinent to ask, if this contracted form be a sign of lateness, how the other late Odyssean or Ionic books have escaped it almost entirely. I has not one instance, though the gen. plur. in question is used 12 times,—4 in - $\epsilon\omega\nu$ , 8 in - $\alpha\omega\nu$ .  $\Psi$  and  $\Omega$  together use it 14 times. They appear to present no case of - $\epsilon\omega\nu$ , but have the - $\alpha\omega\nu$  form 12 times. The contracted form is found twice, but in  $\Psi$  112  $\kappa\nu\eta\mu\hat{\omega}\nu$  seems a likely original (*Ench.* 197), and in  $\Omega$  794 van Leeuwen tells us (*ibid.*, and 41)  $\pi\alpha\mu\hat{\omega}\nu$  must be read.  $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$  in K seems, in fact, to be the only certain form in the four Odyssean books, and it occurs in a line which is one of a few that even some of its defenders are willing to sacrifice. We hesitate for the reasons given.

$\Theta$ , we may add, is equally puzzling in this connection. Dissectors say it was composed in Ionic days as a prologue to I,—according to Wilamowitz, to introduce I and K into the *Iliad*. It must therefore be more Ionic than these Ionic books, but it provides 11 cases of - $\alpha\omega\nu$ , and none of - $\epsilon\omega\nu$  or - $\hat{\omega}\nu$ . So for another Ionism, the gen. in - $\epsilon\omega$ .

It has 7 cases of the old gen. in -*ao* and one of -*ew*, 'Αἰδεω, 16, where, using the indulgence accorded by Dissectors to other parts of the poems, 'Αἰδα can be read. ἐνυμελίω, 552, is in a line which many think should never have been introduced by Barnes into the text. How has this very late book avoided these Ionisms?

(11) 292-4. Translated here from γ 382-4, in Fick's opinion, by the *Einleger*, i.e. the Ionian who inserted K in the *Iliad*. That individual makes clumsy reference to this interpolation, when he says, 571, ὅφρ' ἵρδν ἐτομασσαίατ' Ἀθήνη. But it is very doubtful if that refers to the vow in 292-4. Others think the lines original in γ, but others again prefer K. See p. 118 *supra*. There is nothing on which to decide.

(12) 387-9. Odysseus asks Dolon why he is out,—ἢ τινα συλήσων νεκύιών κατατεθνηώτων; ή σ' Ἐκτωρ προέηκε, κ.τ.λ. Athetesis of 387 as wrongly repeated from 343, with the trivial remark that it was silly of Odysseus to furnish Dolon with a pretext for being abroad. Modern authorities differ. Dr. Leaf thinks it "not obviously out of place." Stier rejects it. Pierron finds it, if "superfluous, not otherwise offensive." We cannot understand the doubt. Why should not Odysseus put such a question? Fick alone would have out 388 f. also, on account of the neglect of the *F* of *Φέκαστα*. See p. 104 *supra*.

(13) Hector wants some one to find out whether the Achaeans are still keeping their camp, or only thinking how to get away (309-12). Dolon, when caught, tells Odysseus that Hector has sent him out to enquire as stated, and then follow (396-9) the above 4 lines (309-12) without the change of a single word, except that some MSS. have the *v.l.* βουλεύοντε . . . ἔθέλοιτε.

The Alexandrians were not quite at one about 396-9. Fick thinks them "unsuitable" and repeated from 309-12. Am.-H., on the contrary, find them thoroughly appropriate. Pierron and Stier retain, and Dr. Leaf does not reject them. The repetition is quite in the epic style, and only a very reckless critic could object to it.

The passage has been much discussed, and a large issue as to the meaning of the pronoun *σφίσι* raised on it. Dr. Monro's judgment, *a.l.* and *H.G.* 221 f., seems to set the matter at rest. See also Cauer, *Grdfrgn.* 468 f., and further at end of next case.

(14) Nestor wants some one to go out to ascertain the Trojan intentions,—whether the force is to remain on the plain or return to the city (208-10). Odysseus asks Dolon (409-11) in the same words. It is alleged by Fick and other critics, following the Alexandrians, that in 409-11 we have another case of transplanting,—from 208-10. Stier retains them. Pierron doubts and brackets. Dr. Monro only says it is "very possible the lines are wrongly repeated." Sickel (*Q.H.* i. 11) retains them, as "such repetitions are characteristic of the poet," the (to him) incompetent author of K. Let us look into the reasons. First, Dolon, though he answers the other questions put to

him, does not notice the one in 409-11. But when he had said the allies were sleeping and the Trojans on watch, was there any need for Odysseus to wait for him to say explicitly that the army was *not* going either to attack or to return to the city? Secondly, there is an "awkward change from the direct to the dependent question," which is not the case in 208-10. But both Leaf and Monro quote *a* 170 f. as a similar case. It is repeated in § 188 f. See for the reverse change, *a* 406. See also Leaf on K 142, Cauer, *Grdfrgn.* 386 ff., and Naber, § 28. Thirdly, the question is absurd when the night is so far advanced. But does not that objection apply with almost equal force to 208-10? See what Odysseus says in 251 shortly after Nestor has uttered those three lines. There is absurdity, in both cases, if one is to test an epic poet's chronology on the strict principles that are applied to an historical narrative.

I suggest that cases (13) and (14) be considered together. They are identical. The hand that altered *βούλευονται* and *ἐθέλονται* in the first case would probably have made a similar alteration in the second, had the verbs in 208-10 not been too intractable. There is evidence that those two words are original in the fact that *φυλάσσονται* in 396 is in the indic. It resisted change to the opt. Dr. Monro points out that the opt. is wrong.

(15) 496 f. Diomede kills Rhēsus, who is asleep, *ἀσθμαίνοντα*, *κακὸν γὰρ ὄναρ κεφαλῆφιν ἐπέστη τὴν νύκταν*, *Οἰνεῖδαο πάις, δὲ μῆτιν Αθήνης*. 497 was athetised. Fick and most editors agree. For the reasons see Leaf, *a.l.*

For the neglect of *F* in *Oἰνεῖδαο*, and for the objections to *τὴν νύκταν*, see pp. 104 and 82 *supra*. And if these prove the line late, we may argue that the gen. in *-ao* proves it early. How could the interpolator avoid *Oἰνεῖδεω νιός*? Dr. Leaf adds that "Homer" is true to nature and would not make a stranger appear in a dream. He thinks a rhapsode took *κακὸν ὄναρ* to mean not a dream but, in bitter irony, Diomede himself, and added 497 "to explain his meaning." But it is hard to believe that he would have done it so badly.

It is not necessary to infer interpolation. The sense in which most readers will take the passage is well put by Stier,—*die zu Häupten stehende Traumgestalt ward beim schrecklichen bewachen plötzlich zum leibhaften Tydiden*.

(16) 530 f. *μάστιξεν δ' ἵππους, τῷ δ' οὐκ ἀέκοντε πετέσθην νῆας ἔπι γλαφυράς τῇ γὰρ φίλον ἐπλεπτο θυμῷ*. Most editors ask why the Thracian steeds should like to reach the Achaean camp. Mr. Agar (*J. Phil.* xxiv. 280) has given a simple solution. Put *τῷ δ' . . . πετέσθην* in parenthesis, and read *τῇ γάρ κ.τ.λ.* of Diomede, and all is clear. For *μάστιξεν ἵππους νῆας ἔπι* he quotes II 728, *ἵππους ἐς πόλεμον πεπληγέμεν*. Add A 280 f. and P 624 f. In a modern poet the addition *τῇ γάρ, κ.τ.λ.*, might, as Dr. Leaf thinks, be flat. But Homeric repetition,—and 530 f. are of the nature of a formula,—is a

thing by itself, and its ways require careful attention. As regards the omission of 531 in some MSS., that may mean only that the misconstruction of the passage prevailed in ancient times.

(17) 534. Zenodotus thought borrowed from δ 140. It might possibly be an imitation. For arguing interpolation there is no warrant. And see p. 120 *supra*.

(18) 566 to end, we owe, according to Fick, to the *Einleger*. 566 on model of Λ 618 and N 240, and 567 after Θ 434 and Φ 30. 576 = δ 48, 577 = ξ 96. For the inference from these equations that K is the borrower, *ipse dixit*; nothing more. *ἱρόν* = "offering" only here; elsewhere *ἱερά*. See p. 57 *supra*. χρωτός, 575, un-Homeric. See p. 51 *supra*. Τυδεΐδεω for -δαο, 566, is objectionable. See p. 224 *supra*, on the opposition to Fick's Ionic views.

Fick points out "perversities" also. Diomedes alone claims (!) the horses. But Odysseus had no use for horses, and perhaps he admitted they were the *spolia* of Diomedes, who had done most of the actual work. Again, Odysseus places the "weapon-booty" in Diomedes's ship "till they should get the offering ready," though Diomedes alone had vowed one! This is micrology. So as to the warm bath after a wash in the sea (p. 181 *supra*). And then the taking of δεῖπνον before sunrise. Everything is "unnatural and peculiar." Grimm and Paley also think the conclusion of the book unsatisfactory. The latter thinks 532 to the end may have been "added by another, though doubtless ancient, hand." Nitzsch, however (see Ranke, 6), thought that K was perhaps an enlargement from an original lay consisting of 203 to the end. No sufficient reason for suspicion has been adduced. It is true the poet does not, at the close, enlarge fully on every point. An ancient audience or ancient readers would not object. The adventure over, the horses admired and jubilation duly expressed, the poet *ad eventum festinat*, and who are we, Lange asks (*Jb.* 1875 (?), 141), to prescribe what should be described and what not? Cauer (*Grdfrgn.* 441) thinks the ending is *wohl disponiert*. Bergk (p. 599) praises the poet for avoiding unnecessary detail. Does he not after all tell us enough? The old poets should surely be allowed some discretion. "The Epic does' not need to be as explicit in respect to the readily obvious, as, say, a Government report" (*C.R.* xv. 292). The author of K chooses to describe the wakening of Odysseus and Diomedes; are we to quarrel with him because he says of others, in one line, that they were fetched to the fosse? Had he told us how every one of them was wakened, he would certainly have been taken to task. πᾶσιν ἀδεῦν χαλεπόν. The critics object to his diffuseness in the opening part of the lay. Now that he closes succinctly, he is blamed again. *Damnatur ob hoc, culpatur ob illud*. Strait is the fairway in which he must shape his course, if he is to please modern critics.

It is surely rash to infer un genuineness from an ending not quite satisfactory to our tastes. Perfunctory and even muddled conclusions

are not unknown in modern compositions. Mr. Lang has a note in one of his works as to the unsatisfactory winding up of some of Scott's stories. The close of *Paradise Regained* has been criticised. A Homeric Dissector would excise the last four lines. Shakespeare sometimes finishes in a hurry. *As you like it* "ends in a farrago of childish impossibilities" (*English Rev.* Oct. 1909). The close of *Measure for Measure* has also been unfavourably judged, and that of *Hermann and Dorothaea*.

## APPENDIX B

K 465-8

ως ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, καὶ ἀπὸ ἔθεν ὑψόσ' ἀείρας  
θῆκεν ἀνὰ μυρίκην· δέελον δὲ πὶ σῆμά τ' ἔθηκε,  
συμμάρφως δόνακας μυρίκης τ' ἐριθηλέας ὅξους,  
μὴ λάθοι αὖτις ιόντε θοὴν διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν.

THE difficulties of this passage are stated as follows by Dr. Leaf in his note on it. δέελος is a crux. It does not occur again in Greek, except in a gloss of Hesychius. It may be an older uncontracted form of δῆλος, but if so and it agrees with σῆμα, the position of τε is hardly to be explained. Christ and others join δέ τε, but for this there is no sufficient analogy. δέελον δέ τε σῆμ' ἐπέθηκεν has been conjectured, but there is no reason why this should have been corrupted. If we omit the τ' to get the sense "he put up a conspicuous sign," the hiatus left is intolerable. Following Hesych., δέελος· δεσμός, we can translate "he put up a bundle and a mark," but this is not satisfactory. Dr. Leaf suggests θῆκεν ἀνὰ μυρίκην δὲ ἐλῶν ἐπὶ σήματ' ἔθηκεν, "took and set marks on the tamarisk."<sup>1</sup> ἀνὰ μυρίκην must then be supplied to the first clause from the second, and ἐλῶν is virtually superfluous like φέρων, H 304.—δὲ ἐλῶν is really no change, only a different grouping of the letters ΔΕΕΛΟΝ. On the mysterious words which οἱ μεταχαρακτηρίζοντες evolved, see Mr. Agar, 320.

But Dr. Leaf's emendation does not make all quite satisfactory. There is perhaps more corruption. The words ἀπὸ ἔθεν ὑψόσ' ἀείρας invite attention. They seem to be surplusage. Odysseus and Diomede have taken from the body of Dolon his cap and wolf-skin, his bow and his spear,—the last called ὁξὺν ἄκοντα, 335, and δόρυ μακρόν, 459, which are convertible terms (see a proof in Petersdorff, *Germanen u. Griechen*, 111 f.). These spoils Ἀθηναίγ λητίδι δόσος Ὁδυσσεὺς ὑψόσ' ἀνέσχεθε χειρί, and uttered a prayer, 460 f. After this the words ἀπὸ ἔθεν, κ.τ.λ., if not an absolutely objectionable repetition, are certainly not required. It is suggested that they may conceal the familiar ἐπὶ χθονὶ ποιλυβοτείρη,—which always ends the verse. The

<sup>1</sup> It may be assumed that either σῆμα τόξον -a, ιερόν -a. σῆμα and σήματα are or σήματα will do. Cf. the uses of δῶρον -a, used of the same thing in Z 168, 176.

rhythm of the two phrases is identical, and the sounds of their individual syllables very similar. We know that epithets and phrases which are common replaced each other at times. See p. 25 *supra*, and C.R. xv. 291 ff. The words *ἴψος' ἀείρας* may be due to a reminiscence of *ἴψος' ἀνέσχεθε* in 461 immediately before the prayer. Parts of *ἄειρα* frequently end lines in the *Iliad*. There are three instances in K itself, 30, 80 and 505, in the last *ἴψος' ἀείρας* as in our passage. A scribe might make such a slip.

The other place where corruption is possible is the phrase *θῆκεν ἀνὰ μυρίκην*. The use of *ἀνά* is not a common one. Indeed it would be difficult to find an exact parallel to it in Homer. See examples of *ἀνά* collected in H.G. § 210. The absence of a noun for *θῆκεν* to govern is also open to remark. It is suggested that the word *ἔναρα*, which is used in 528 and 570 to describe the accoutrements of Dolon, has been altered. The word would be quite appropriate in 466, and it can be read with the change of only one letter. The whole passage would then read thus:—

ώς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ  
θῆκ' ᔁναρα· μυρίκην δὲ ἐλῶν ἐπὶ σήματ' ἔθηκε,  
συμμάρψας κ.τ.λ.

This also gets rid of the objectionable *τε*. And the sense seems good. "Thus he spake and laid the spoils on the bountiful earth. And taking hold of a tamarisk placed marks (at the spot or over the spoils), grasping together reeds and luxuriant shoots of tamarisk."

According to the vulgate we must understand that the heroes left the spoils on a tamarisk tree, plain to be seen,—the spear certainly could not well be concealed,—by any straggler,—cf. *τινα ἐσχατόωντα*, 206,—who might have come out *τινα συλήσων νεκύων*, 343, 387. There would thus be a risk of their losing their booty. Odysseus knew better. A track ran past the spot, 339, 349, one of many, II 374, that crossed the plain, and one Trojan they had already found using it. They had to conceal their spoil, and this they did effectually by laying it on the ground and covering it with brushwood,—an inconspicuous mark, but enough to indicate the spot to them when they returned along the road. There is no mention of the tamarisk when they recover the things, 528 f.

For the tamarisk reference may be made to Fellner, *Hom. Flora*, 18, and Buchholz, *Realien*, i. 2, 252 f. Dr. Otto Stapf, of the Royal Gardens, Kew, has also kindly supplied me with information. The tamarisk is often a mere bush, a collection of slender stems rising straight from the root, but some species are trees of considerable size, as *T. tetrandra* and *T. Pallasi*, the latter of which has been found near Abydos. Unfortunately there is nothing in Homer outside our passage that enables us to decide whether it was bush or tree on the Trojan plain. Even a bush of the kind described above might upset

a light car, as in Z 239. In Φ 18 the expression used of Achilles' spear may only mean "lying among the tamarisk bushes." Φ 350 tells us nothing. We must depend on the wording of the lines we are seeking to interpret. If we suppose the *μυρίκη* was a bush, *ἀνά* does not seem appropriate. If we take it to be a tree, the phrase *θῆκεν ἀνὰ μυρίκην* seems a poor description of the operation implied,—the disposal of a collection of separate articles in a tree. In either case what necessity was there for a mark? The spear would be easily seen by the heroes as they passed on their return,—if some third person had not anticipated them.

## APPENDIX C

### EMENDATIONS

(38) Τρώεσσιν ἐπίσκοπον; (342), νήεσσιν ἐπίσκοπος ἡμετέρησιν. ἐπίσκοπος = "spy" is to Orszulik an Odyssean note. He points to θ 163, ἐπίσκοπος δόδαίων, and says the word has the same meaning there. We cannot admit that. And the reading in θ is not certain. Aristophanes read ἐπίστροφος, which Nauck approved. In K, in each case, read -εσσιν ἔπι σκοπόν(s), which Christ and others adopt. (In N 450 there is a v.l., Κρήτη ἔπι οὐρον for ἐπίουρον.) Orszulik, however, thinks that makes no difference to his argument, as σκοπός = "spy," "scout," recurs outside K only χ 156. But see, in the *Iliad*, B 792, Σ 523, Ω 799.

(44) ἦ τίς κε(ν) ἐρύσσεται. van Herwerden would write κ' ἔπι ρύσσεται, which van Leeuwen approves, *Mnemos*. xix. 163. Other editors are satisfied with the vulgate.—The commentaries and Mr. Agar's *Homerica* shew that, like other small words, ἔπι has at times dropped out of and been put into the text. In K 161 for δλίγος δ' ἔπι, there is the v.l. δλίγος δέ τε. On 506, ἦ ἔπι τῶν πλεόνων Θρηκῶν, see p. 80 *supra*, and on ἔπ' αὐτῶν, 493, p. 236 *infra*.

(48) ἄνδρ' ἔνα τοσσάδε μέρμερ' ἐπ' ἥματι μητίσασθαι, "in the space of one day." Occurrences of the phrase in a different sense are cited. But in two, Λ 444, N 234, it is (ἐπ') ἥματι τῷδε; in T 229, β 284, the phrase seems to have the same meaning as in K; and in the remaining two, μ 105, ξ 105, there is no great variation. See Monro and Leaf on K 48, comparing ἐπὶ νυκτί, Θ 529. So there is no need to amend.—Perhaps ἐν' ἥματι? Cf. ἄνδρ' ἔνα in the beginning of the verse. Aristarchus, ἐν ἥματι.—ἐπ' ἥματι is not late, at least not Attic (Jebb on *Oed. Col.* 688).

(95) στηθέων ἐκθρψσκει. στηθέων does not recur, though other cases of the plural do,—aus metrischen Rücksichten fast nur der Dat. (Witte, *Sing. u. Plur.* 18). But the objection is to the synizesis. See Menrad, 79. He would read στήθεος, drawing a distinction in meaning between the sing. and plur. which Witte (*op. cit.* 86 n.) apparently will not allow. But some editors, as Christ, accept στήθεος. And see *Ench.* 48. On the whole a change seems not required. A

copyist might have made a slip ; the alteration to  $\sigma\tau\eta\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$  would hardly be deliberate.—As to synizesis, the poems cannot be purged of it without violence. Menrad is not a good guide (Platt in *J. Philol.* xviii. 168). He assumes certain tracts in the poems are late, and excises inconvenient lines. So in the *Ench.* 48. Nothing is then impossible. A more moderate view is expressed in *H.G.* 354. In the *Mēnis* itself, Λ 282, we have synizesis in this same word,  $\sigma\tau\eta\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ , not to mention  $\ddot{a}\phi\rho\epsilon\omega$ , on which various attempts have been made (Leaf, *a.l.*), earlier in the line.

(105)  $\delta\sigma\alpha\pi\omega\nu$   $\nu\nu\nu$  = “now,” for  $\nu\hat{\nu}\nu$ , elsewhere only Ψ 485.  $\nu\hat{\nu}\nu$   $\ddot{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  has slight MS. support (Leaf, *a.l.*), and Fick adopts it. Dr. Monro (*H.G.* 320) is in favour of it. The combination recurs, we may add, in O 110,  $\eta\delta\eta\gamma\dot{\alpha}\rho\nu\nu\nu\ddot{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}$ . Another place where both  $\nu\hat{\nu}\nu$  and  $\nu\nu\nu$  have MS. support is ξ 325. And see Cobet, *M.C.* 393.

(105)  $\ddot{a}\lambda\lambda\alpha\mu\nu o\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ , closing the verse. Those who object to contraction correct to  $\ddot{a}\lambda\lambda\alpha F' o\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ . But see Leaf on P 709. Emendation is possible only in some occurrences of  $o\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ . The change in the present case assumes that  $F\epsilon$  and  $\mu\nu$  are interchangeable. I am not competent to express an opinion, but I observe that Ameis (*Hom. Kleinigktn.* 22) does not think so. See also Funk; in a paper *Auf Hom. Bezugliches*, (1884), 2 and 9.

To bar contraction is a resource of the Higher Criticism that is used unsparingly. The poet or poets, we know, prefer open forms, because they prefer the dactyl to the spondee. But what demonstration is there that contraction was unknown or very rare, which is not based on an assumed classification of books into early and late? To Ludwich the only explanation of this dogma that suggests itself is,—*tel est notre bon plaisir*.<sup>1</sup> Hundreds of contracted forms are, he says, “unshakably firm” in the text; to remove others simply because they can be removed is mere mania. See also *H.G.* 354, the notes on α 378 and η 94 in the conspicuously sound commentary of M. and R., Thouvenin in *Philolog.* lxiv. 321 ff., Meillet on Bechtel in *M.S.L.* xv. 167, and Platt in *J. Phil.* xviii. 127. When a contraction or a synizesis is objected to, the case must be considered on its merits. There is no presumption against its genuineness, *prima facie*. It is not enough to say “Ionism” and “late,” as Robert does in his great work.

(106)  $\kappa\acute{\eta}\delta\epsilon\sigma\iota\mu\omega\chi\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\omega$ . Orszulik remarks that the only other verb in Homer from this root is  $\mu\omega\chi\theta\acute{\iota}\omega$ , which is  $\ddot{a}.$  λ., B 723, *i.e.* in the “late” Boiotia. That was barely worth noting. Such pairs of forms are not uncommon,— $\kappa\omega\alpha\beta\acute{\iota}\omega -\acute{\iota}\omega$ ,  $\ddot{\omega}\chi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega -\acute{\iota}\omega$ , etc. And as the MSS. give now one form and now another, *e.g.*, in M 448 and ρ 299, we might read  $\mu\omega\chi\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\omega$  in 106 without great daring,—if there were any need.

<sup>1</sup> *Ar.* ii. 258 *n.* See also his review of Nauck's *Iliad*, *ibid.* 51 ff. Menrad, 179 ff., comments on Ludwich's *audentia* in this matter.

(127) *ἴνα γάρ σφιν ἐπέφραδον*, where *ἴνα*, elsewhere relative, is said to be demonstrative. See Leaf's note. *ἴνα τ' ἄρα*, Bekker and Düntzer; *ἴν' ἄρα*, Peppmüller. But others see no cause to amend. Translate "for that is where" (Paley) or *wo nämlich* (LaRoche) or "where in fact" with Monro, who adds, "*ἴνα* need not be demonstrative. Rather it is the use of *γάρ* that is idiomatic."

(151) *ἐκτὸς ἀπὸ κλισίης*. van Herwerden (*Mnemos.* xviii. 34) objects to this as = *procul a tentorio*, whereas the poet simply meant to say that Diomede was sleeping outside, not in, his hut. So he proposes *ἔκτοσθε κλισίης*. But as it is said Diomede was sleeping surrounded by his men, he may well have been at some distance from his quarters.

(159) *τί πάννυχον ὕπνον ἀωτεῖς*; van Herwerden objects (*ibid.*) that the adj. is in Homer always applied to persons and not to things. He will not read *πάννυχος*, *quia vix recte ὕπνον careat epitheto*. But *ὕπνος* occurs elsewhere without an epithet, and with *ἀωτεῖς* the bare noun seems quite good.

(180) *οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ φυλάκεσσιν ἔν ἀγρομένουσιν ἔμιχθεν*. If any one concurs in the objection of Dr. Leaf, who pronounces this line a reminiscence of Γ 209, he may read with Bentley *συναγρομένουσιν*. Cf. *συναγειρόμενοι*, Ω 802. But no change is necessary.

(184) *θηρὸς ἀκούσαντες κρατερόφρονος*, *ὅς τε καθ' ὑλην . . .* to which might be added *κλάγξαντος ἀκουσαί*, 276. Orszulik finds the construction peculiar. He says that the nearest cases are *ἀκονέμεν* *ἀοιδοῦ*, α 370, and *αὐδήσαντος ἀκουσε*, i 497, and that elsewhere the verb has a word denoting a sound as object in the accus. But see B 98, II 211, O 506, κ 221. Had there been anything in the objection, we might have suggested an original *θῆρ* *ἐσακούσαντες*, the (legitimate) hiatus in *κρατερόφρονα*, *ὅς τε* leading to the change. In Eurip. *Alc.* 31, there is a similar double reading, *μὴν ἐσέρχεται* and *μηνὸς ἐρχεται*.

(198) *τάφρον δ' ἐκδιαβάντες*. In similar compounds, Orszulik says, the *διά* comes before the *ἐκ*. Apparently there are only two such in Homer,—*διέξερόμαι* and *διέξειμι*. Not much is to be inferred from this. We can, if necessary, adopt *εν διαβάντες* from the scholia. The combination occurs M 458, though in a special sense. The MSS. waver between *ἐκ δίης* and *ενδίης*, II 365, and in γ 82 both *οὐ δήμιος* and *ἐκδήμιος* have support.

(199) *ὅθι δὴ νεκύῶν διεφαίνετο χῶρος πιπτόντων*. The last word, Dr. Leaf thinks, is hardly to be explained. Some, as Christ, write *πιπτεότων*, comparing Φ 503 and χ 384; others *τεθνέώτων*. Stier, a.l., defends the word,—*Imperf. in lebendigen Rückblick: wo, als so viele tot hinsanken (θνητούντων), die Erde noch sichtbar blieb*. It is remarkable how the poet figures the plain as covered with corpses. See 298 and 349. You could not leave the track without treading on them! There is exactly the same hyperbole in the *Sháhnáma* (Warner's translation),—

. . . . that what with corpses  
And trunkless heads no vacant space was seen  
For troops to fight on, wheel, or pass between.

(236) *φαινομένων τὸν ἄριστον*, “a curious use, which must mean ‘as they present themselves.’” So Dr. Leaf. He mentions the conjecture *φαινόμενόν τοι*, surely not a very violent one. But he prefers to keep *τόν*, as K is unsound in the matter of the Article. We do not admit that. As to *φαινομένων*, G. Schulze proves (*Hermes*, xxviii. 19 ff.) from Xenophon that LaRoche’s *welche sich angeboten haben* is right. Classen (*Beobachtgn.* 167 f.) seems to find nothing wrong. Grossmann (*Homerica*, 25) objects to *φαινόμενον*. Dr. Leaf’s translation is not acceptable. The article with a superlative is common. But *τόν* here is probably pronominal.

(292) *βοῦν ἥννιν εὐρυμέτωπον*. It is not suggested that *ἥννιν* (which seems to be wrongly accented,—but see *Glotta*, i. 210) is a late form, but, if there is anything against K, we may read with *Ench.* 15, 211, *ἥνιδα*. van Leeuwen there goes so far as to say a dactyl is necessary before the Bucolic Diaeresis. Cf. Platt, *J. Phil.* xviii. 150 f. But LaRoche appears to have proved that a spondee there is as good as a dactyl (*Jb.* 1899, 140). The matter has been given a new aspect by Sommer in *Glotta*, i. 150, 155. *ἥνιδα* may have been changed to *ἥννιν* to remove the hiatus.

(343) *ἢ τινὰ* (387, *ἢ τινα*) *συλήσων νεκύνων κατατεθνητῶν*. Orszulik objects that *συλάω* elsewhere has either the double accus. or only the accus. of the thing. But *συλείω*, which is only another form,—cf. *μωμάομαι -εύω*, *ἀγοράομαι -εύω*, *οίνοχέω -εύω*, and *θηρητήρ* with *θηρεύω*,—has the construction objected to in E 48, and cf. Ω 436. Both constructions are found in later Greek,—L. and S., s.v. *συλάω*. But there may be corruption. Perhaps *ἢ ἔντεα συλήσων?* Such a synizesis with *ἢ* in the opening of a line is not uncommon (*H.G.* 351, and Menrad, 177).

(344) *ἄλλ' ἐώμεν μιν πρῶτα*. . . . The synizesis and the contraction in *ἐώμεν* are objected to. See Leaf, *a.l.*, and on E 256. Also, the pronoun is in a wrong position. So Fick and others accept *ἄλλά F' ἐώμεν πρῶτα* or *ἄλλ' ἐάωμεν πρῶτα*. The *μιν* may be due to the last syllable of the preceding word.

(347) *ἀπὸ στρατόφι*. Apparently no more peculiar than *ἀπ'* *αὐτόφιν*, *ἀπὸ χαλκόφι*, Λ 44, 351. On the former Hoogvliet says (*Studia Hom.* 53) *videtur depravatum ex αὐτόῳ*, and possibly we should read *στρατό* in 347, or *στρατόθεν* (cf. *ἀπ'* *οὐρανόθεν*). But there is no good reason for interfering (*H.G.* 149, under *ἀπό*).

(364) *λαοῦ ἀποτμήξαντε* (*ἐ*)*δώκετον ἐμμενὲς αἰεί*. The ending *-ον* in the 3 pers. dual of an historical tense occurs elsewhere only N 346 and Σ 583, and the cases have been much discussed. Curtius (*Verb*, 52 f.) remarks that all three are in late passages, and so Christ (*Interpol.* 201). See also *H.G.* 6, and Bekker, *Hom. Blät.* i. 50 f.

Naber suggested διώκαθον, which van Leeuwen accepts (*Ench.* 292 f.). van Herwerden (*Mnemos.* xix. 164) proposes ἐδίεσθην for ἐδιώκετον, *quod facillime e glossemate nasci potuit*. On these forms see Bréal (p. 195). It is doubtful if there be need for a change, but in support of van Leeuwen's conjecture see a very similar line, X 456, μοῦνον ἀποτμήξας πόλιος πεδίονδε δίηται. And see p. 51 *supra*.

(431) καὶ Φρύγες ἵππομάχοι, reading of Ar. adopted by some editors against the ἵπποδαμοι of all the MSS. The word recurs only in M, where it is a proper name. As M is "late," Orszulik finds this noteworthy! Interchange of epithets is common. See p. 25 *supra*. In K itself we have ἀμύμονα and ποδώκεα, 323, and ἀμβροσίην and ὄρφναῖην, 142.

(449) ἀπολύσομεν ἡὲ μεθῶμεν. Orszulik objects to the contraction in the last word. For the ground see *Ench.* 307, and Leaf on X 381. The former would read ἡ μεθέωμεν. According to *H.G.* 70, it is "probably more correct to write these words with εω," so that we should perhaps read ἡὲ μεθέωμεν. So Rzach (*Iliad, Add. et Corrig.*). Other instances of the vice here imputed are in what Dr. Leaf considers late books or passages.

(451) ἡὲ διοπτεύσων ἡ ἐναντίβιον πολεμίξων. One of a few instances, according to Dr. Leaf, on Φ 576, in which ᾗ suffers corruption. He would read ἡ ἀντίβιον. But see Agar, p. 56, and *C.R.* xix. 407. Either reading will do.

(478) οὐς νῶιν πίφανσκε Δόλων. The *i* in πιφανσκω, naturally short, is long in *thesi* only here in Homer (Leaf, *a.l.*). We might accept Brandreth's ἐπίφανσκε. But there is no necessity. Such a licence is not unknown (Ludwich, *Ar.* ii. 290). No objection is taken to καὶ λίην, A 553. See Ebel. *s.v.* λίην, quoting Spitzner. Paley, on M 208, suggests that our word was pronounced πιπφανσκω, as ὄφιν, ὄπφων in αἰόλον ὄφων ending the στίχος μείονος, M 208. So Jebb, p. 195. Goebel (*Lexil.* i. 64) gives the original form as πιφανσκω.

(486) αἴγεστιν ἡ ὀίεσσι. In *Ench.* 210 f. the form αἴγεσσ' is preferred, with Bekker. There is authority, but Mr. Agar (283; cf. 75) finds in the *Odyssey* instances in which "the archaic form of the dat. pl. in -εστι" has been expelled from the text. Nor is he singular in restoring this form, as appears from the discussion in the *Ench.* Dr. Monro (*H.G.* 85) only remarks that -εστι for the ending -εσσι is "very rare."

(493) ἀήθεσσον γὰρ ἔτ' αὐτῶν, of Rhēsus' horses and the corpses about them. The use of αὐτῶν in the weak sense, "them," is late (Leaf, *a.l.*). It seems to be the ordinary "unemphatic" use which is common (*H.G.* 219 (3)). It is found, for instance, in A 401 and 473, which are in the *Mēnis*. In some cases,—as K 25, where αὐτῷ can be read, with some MS. authority,—emendation is possible. It is true, as Baumeister says (*Hym. Merc.* 234), that "αὐτός often makes

confusion." In our passage Hoogvliet (*op. cit.* 61) has conjectured ἀγέθεσσον γὰρ ἀντῆς, as a word meaning "battle" is required. Compare the case in Agar, 156, and that in O 621, where ἀκτήν or -τῆ is a *v.l.* for αὐτήν in τά τε προσερέυγεται αὐτήν. In a third occurrence of αὐτός in K, 345, we ought perhaps to read αὐτοί for αὐτόν (Ludwich, *a.l.*, quoting Axt and Döderlein). Mr. Agar's work has many instructive discussions on this word. See also Mr. Allen's review in *C.Q.* iii. 226.

(499) σὺν δ' ἡειρεν ῥμᾶσι, of Odysseus and the horses of Rhēsus. The verb has been much discussed. Axt (*Conject. Hom.* 8) conjectured σὺν δὴ εἰρεν or σὺν δὲ δὴ εἰρεν (referring for the particles to Λ 524, N 52, P 466). The sense would be "coupled together." But the weight of authority is for accepting the text and taking ἡείρω not as the common verb, but as a separate one = "harness," συνάγειν καὶ συναρμόζειν. Other words and expressions in the poems are referred to in support of this. See Leaf, *a.l.*; *Ench.* 343, 488; *H.G.* 60; Schultze, 420; and Cobet, *M.C.* 326. If Meillet is right (*M.S.L.* xv. 150) in taking ἡείρω, "raise," as from ἀήρ, then surely our verb is quite distinct.

There is nothing against the credit of K here, but the decision of the learned that the expression means "harnessed" helps to the solution of the question whether Odysseus and Diomede rode or drove back to camp. See pp. 274 ff. *infra*.

## APPENDIX D

### DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE GRAMMAR OF THE *ILIAD* AND THAT OF THE *ODYSSEY*

I CONFINE myself here generally to supplementing the remarks made on Dr. Monro's cases by Miss Stawell in *Hom. and Il.* App. C. The number prefixed to each case below is the number of the section in that Appendix.

1. The form  $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\nu$ . The enumeration does not appear to be complete. Gehring gives additional cases from the *Il.* and one more, ψ 304, from the *Od.* It is to be noted that this Iliadic form occurs in two of the late Odyssean books, I 419, 686, K 27, 465. And is it not likely that  $\epsilon\circ$ ,  $\epsilon\hat{\nu}$ , and  $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\nu$  have in some cases been interchanged?

2 and 3.  $\alpha\mu\phi\acute{i}$  with dat. and  $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{i}$  with gen. = "concerning," with certain verbs. It should be noted that all seven cases of the former, and all save one, a 405, of the latter, from the *Od.*, relate to Odysseus himself. The difference in subject matter between the two poems has its influence. It is natural, again, that in the *Il.* the "contest" cases should be more numerous. And if cases of the other class occur in that poem, what is the preposition or construction used? Finally, it may be added that if  $\nu\acute{e}k\omega s\pi\acute{e}\rho i\delta\acute{e}\iota\mu a$ , P 240 (cf. P 242), be claimed for the *Iliad*, then K 93,  $\Delta\alpha\nu\acute{a}\omega n\pi\acute{e}\rho i\delta\acute{e}\iota\mu a$ , may also be quoted. In all three cases there is MS. authority for both  $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{i}\delta\acute{e}\iota\mu a$  and  $\pi\acute{e}\rho i\delta\acute{e}\iota\mu a$ .

5.  $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\acute{i}$  with the acc. of a person = "in quest of." The adherence of K to the use said to be Iliadic has been noted, p. 75 *supra*. But Miss Stawell shews that the difference between the two poems in this respect is "microscopic."

6.  $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\acute{i}$  with the acc., to imply extent without motion. See pp. 72 f. *supra*.

10.  $\dot{\alpha}v\acute{a}$  with the acc., with collective nouns = "through." K again conforms to the Iliadic usage.

13. The phrase  $\delta i\alpha\nu\acute{e}kta$ . See p. 74 *supra*.

14.  $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$  with plur. of persons = "among" and with abstract nouns. See pp. 74 f. *supra*.

16.  $\dot{\epsilon}k$  with the gen. = "in consequence of." See p. 74 *supra*.

21. "The reflexive use of *ἴο*, *οῖ*, *ἴ* is much less common in the *Od.*, and is chiefly found in fixed combinations, such as *ἀπό οἴο*, *προτὶ οῖ*" (Monro, *Odyssey*, 333). "Excluding Infinitival and Subordinate Clauses, there are 43 examples in the *Il.*, against 18 in the *Od.*" (*H.G.* 220). This appears, from Miss Stawell's account, to be Ebeling's enumeration. Gehring's seems to give different results. And, although Miss Stawell's totals agree with those of the *H.G.*, the instances included in the lists do not. Four mentioned on p. 219 of the *H.G.*, B 239, Δ 400, E 56 and τ 446, are not found in the list in *Hom. and Il.* And there are other elements of uncertainty. Readings vary, as *πρόσθεν* for *πρὸ οἴθεν*, E 96 and N 803. And the Infinitival and Subordinate Clauses are a difficulty. Opinions will differ about them. Miss Stawell includes in her list three cases, I 306, 392, and η 217, which Dr. Monro (p. 219) considers Infinitival, but excludes his instance (p. 220) of a Subordinate Clause, Α 439. I read Dr. Monro's words (p. 220) "excluding infinitival and subordinate clauses" as referring to all such clauses. If a distinction is to be drawn regarding the Infinitival cases, and those "where the reference is to the Subject of the governing Verb" (*H.G.* 219) are to be included, then δ 38 and perhaps other cases should be included. But surely this exclusion of Infinitival and Subordinate Clauses is an unnecessary refinement. If the pronoun is certainly reflexive, as, e.g., in χ 14, why should the case not be considered? Again, if the plur. *σφεῖς* followed by *αὐτοῖ* is to be excluded, why should the sing. with *αὐτός* be included? If it be excluded, like the plur., 7 cases must be refused to the *Il.* and only 4 to the *Od.* A revised list, prepared on other principles, seems to be required. When it is got, it will probably be found that the numbers of fixed phrases, 14 in the *Il.* and 10 in the *Od.*, are not very disproportionate to the totals of the occurrences in the two poems.

And lastly, taking the lists as they stand, we find that out of the 43 cases in the *Il.*, no fewer than 13 are from the four "Odyssean" books. This Iliadic use, though rare in the *Odyssey*, is more than twice as common in the Odyssean area of the *Iliad* as in the other books of that poem, which, twenty in number, have only thirty such uses. There must be something wrong here. It seems better to put the unequal distribution down to chance.

22. Uses of the Article. See Chap. X. *supra*. One result of Miss Stawell's exhaustive examination should be the final suppression of the notion that there is any difference worth considering between Iliadic and Odyssean usage.

23. "The use of *τό* = *for which reason* belongs to the *Iliad*: in θ 332, *τὸ καὶ μοιχάγρι ὁφέλλει* (in the Song of Demodocus), it is doubtless an imitation" (Monro, *Odyssey*, 332). See also *H.G.* 232, where six instances are given from the *Il.*, Γ 176, Η 239, Μ 9, Ρ 404, Τ 213, Ψ 547. But we claim one case for the *Od.*, as other authorities

do not agree with Monro about the Lay in  $\theta$ . M. and R., for instance, find it "neither unworthy of Homer nor unlike him." So Rothe in *Jb.* 1903, 294, LaRoche, Lehrs and Welcker (Hennings, *Odyssee*, 227), and Altendorf, *Ästh. Komm. z. Od.* 32; and see *H. and A.* 234 f. As to the *Il.*, in  $\Psi$  547,  $\tau\hat{\omega}\kappa'$  is as well vouched as  $\tau\acute{o}\kappa\acute{e}v$ . In H 239 it is not at all necessary to take  $\tau\acute{o}$  = "wherefore" (Am.-H. and Leaf, *a.l.*). Dr. Monro himself, *a.l.*, leaves the question open. In P 404 it is decidedly better not to do so (Am.-H.). So we are left with 3 certain cases in the *Il.*, and one of the three, M 9, is in a passage which the critics reject as "patently late." How then comes  $\tau\acute{o}$  there in this sense? Is it imitation? But it is surely not good criticism to impugn a passage by pointing to late forms, and then, when an early construction is found in it, to put it down to imitation. It is the *glaive à double tranchant* again.

"The full correlative  $\tau\acute{o}$  . . .  $\delta$  (whence, by omission of  $\tau\acute{o}$ , the adverbial use of  $\delta$ ) survives in a few places of the *Iliad* only" (Monro, *Odyssey*, 333). This case does not appear to be included in Miss Stawell's list. There are three instances in the *Il.*, A 120, T 421, Y 466. (In I 493,  $\tau\grave{a}\ \phi\rho\nu\acute{e}\omega\nu$  . . .  $\delta$  . . .) But T 421 cannot be claimed, as there is a *v.l.*,  $\epsilon\bar{v}\nu\acute{u}\tau\acute{u}$ ,—which Ludwich prefers; Bentley,  $\tau\acute{u}$ ;  $\tau\acute{o}$  seems to be Bekker's suggestion. There are thus two certain cases, and there is one in the *Odyssey*, γ 146. Possibly δ 771,  $\omega\bar{v}\acute{d}\epsilon\tau\acute{u}\omega\bar{v}\acute{d}\epsilon\delta$  . . . was originally another. But the numbers are too small to prove anything. In *H.G.* 241, Dr. Monro introduces other combinations, O 217, E 406 and T 56 f.,  $\tau\bar{o}\bar{\theta}'\delta\tau\acute{u}$  and the like; but that allows us to appeal to ν 314 and ν 333.

25, 26, 27 are grouped by Dr. Monro (*Odyssey*, 333) in one statement,—"the development by which  $\delta$ ,  $\delta\tau\acute{u}$ ,  $\omega\acute{s}$ ,  $\omega\acute{v}\nu\acute{e}\ka$  came to mean *in respect that*, *because*, and then simply *that*, may be traced in the two Homeric poems. Of the last stage of that development, viz., the use of these words = *that* after verbs of *saying*, there are 2 instances in the *Il.*, 14 in the *Od.* The use of  $\omega\acute{v}\nu\acute{e}\ka$  after verbs of *saying*, *knowing* and the like appears first in the *Od.*" Quotations are not given, and I think the figures are wrong. I had brought out different results, using Gehring's *Index*, and I find my lists confirmed by Miss Stawell's. (There is an enumeration for  $\delta$  and  $\delta\tau\acute{u}$  in Schmitt's *Ursprg. d. Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartikeln*, 27 ff.) I find that after verbs of *saying*  $\delta$  does not occur in the *Il.* There is one case in the *Od.*, μ 374 f. β 45 is doubtful (M. and R. and others, *a.l.*). Even if  $\delta$  =  $\delta\tau\acute{u}$  there, it need not be dependent on  $\pi\acute{v}\phi\acute{a}\nu\acute{s}\kappa\mu\acute{m}\atilde{\iota}\acute{v}\delta'$ ,  $\acute{a}\gamma\phi\acute{r}\acute{e}\nu\acute{w}$ . With similar verbs  $\omega\acute{s}$  is used twice in the *Il.*, A 110, P 642, and six times in the *Od.*, δ 377, θ 498, § 152, ο 158, τ 270, χ 351. But it is in some cases difficult to decide whether  $\omega\acute{s}$  means "that" or "how."  $\delta\tau\acute{u}$  is used thrice in the *Il.*, P 411, 655, X 439; in the *Od.* only once, Π 131.  $\omega\acute{v}\nu\acute{e}\ka$  is said not to be found in this use in the *Il.* after a verb of *saying*; in the *Od.* there are six instances, ε 216, η 300, ν 309, ο 42,

π 330, 379. So that there is development in regard to ὡς and οὗνεκα, and retrogression in regard to ὅτι. Chorizonts can surely derive but little comfort from the lists, especially as there are clear cases of ὡς and ὅτι in the *Mēnis*, A 110 and X 439.

And as regards οὗνεκα, it does not appear to be correct that its use in this construction appears first in the *Od.* See Dr. Monro himself in *H.G.* 240 f. A 21 is a case. Some think the passage spurious, others do not. Dr. Leaf, following Christ, tries to explain the οὗνεκα away, but is not successful. And Dr. Monro notes, regarding the majority of the instances in the *Od.*, that "the verb is followed by an acc. of the *thing*; so that the Relative Clause does not directly take the place of the Object." In short, there is difficulty in construing some of the instances. And finally, the use of οὗνεκα now under reference did not develop into an established common use in later Greek. It remained in poetry only,—L. and S., s.v., and Kühner-Gerth, ii. 356. For Hesiod and the Hymns only *Theog.* 464 and *Hym. Ap.* 376 are quoted, and as *Theog.* 463 has been impugned (see Rzach, *a.l.*), the former case is not certain. Baron (*Le Pronom Relatif*, 128) seems to be incorrect in saying that in the Hymns this has become a current usage.

28. "Attraction of the Relative." It seems doubtful if ε 325, κ 167, κ 517 = λ 25 can be claimed. One might compare them with cases such as H 451, ὅσον τ' ἐπικῶνται ἡώς, ν 114, etc. As regards the instance in A 263, Dr. Monro in *H.G.* 246 says that it "is somewhat different," but see himself and Leaf, *a.l.*

31. "Optative with κεν of unfulfilled conditions." For Dr. Monro's statement of the case, see *H.G.* 273, and his *Odyssey*, 333. The Attic use of the indic. with ἄν or κεν is of course frequent in the poems, but 15 instances of the exceptional opt. are given from the *Il.* and 3 from the *Od.* So it is argued that the use is Iliadic.

The cases from the *Il.* may be grouped as follows:—

- (a) E 311 f. καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' ἀπόλοιτο . . . Αἰνείας,  
εὶ μὴ ἄρ' ὁξὲν νόησε . . . Ἀφροδίτη.
- E 388 ff. καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' ἀπόλοιτο Ἀρῆς . . .  
εὶ μὴ μητρυὴ . . . Ἐρμέῃ ἐξήγγειλεν.
- P 70 f. ἔνθα κε ρέια φέροι κλυτὰ τεύχεα . . .  
Ἄτρετῆς, εὶ μή οἱ ἀγάσσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.
- (b) Δ 539. ἔνθα κεν οὐκέτι ἔργον ἀνὴρ ὄνόσαιτο μετελθών.  
N 127. ὥσταντο φάλαγγες
- καρτεραί, ἀς οὐτ' ἀν κεν Ἀρῆς ὄνόσαιτο μετελθών.
- N 343 f. μάλα κεν θραυσκάρδιος εἴη  
ὅς τότε γηθήσειεν ἴδων πόνον οὐδέν ἀκάχοιτο.
- P 398 f. οὐδέ κ' Ἀρῆς λαοστόδος οὐδέ κ' Ἀθήνη  
τόν γε ἴδοντ' ὄνόσαιτ', οὐδέ εἰ μάλα μιν χόλος ἵκοι.
- (c) Γ 220. φαίης κε ζάκοτόν τέ τιν' ἔμμεναι.

- Δ 223. ἐνθ' οὐκ ἀν βρίζοντα ἴδοις Ἀγαμέμνονα.  
 Δ 429 f. οὐδὲ κε φαῖης τόσσον λαδν ἔπεσθαι.  
 E 85. Τυδεῖδην δ' οὐκ ἀν γνοῖης ποτέρουσι μετείη.  
 O 697 f. φαῖης κ' ἀκμῆτας . . . ἀλλήλουσιν ἄντεσθ'.  
 P 366 f. οὐδὲ κε φαῖης . . . ἡέλιον σῶν ἔμμεναι.  
 (d) B 80 f. εὶ μέν τις τὸν ὄνειρον . . . ἄλλος ἔνισπε,  
     ψεῦδός κεν φαῖμεν καὶ νοσφιξούμεθα . . .  
 M 58 f. ἐνθ' οὐ κεν ρέα ἵππος . . . ἐσβαίη.

Dr. Monro does not include Ω 220 ff., which is a repetition of B 80 f. with only slight alteration.

The three cases from the *Od.* are:—

- ε 73 f. ἐνθα κ' ἔπειτα καὶ ἀθάνατός περ ἐπελθὼν  
     θηγῆσαιτο ἰδών.  
 η 293 f. ὡς οὐκ ἀν ἔλποιο νεώτερον ἀντιάσαντα  
     ἐρξέμεν.  
 ν 86 f. ἡ δὲ μάλ' ἀσφαλέως θέεν . . . οὐδέ κεν ἵρηξ  
     κίρκος ὁμαρτήσειεν.

Apparently from his note *a.l.*, Dr. Monro should have added—

- ι 241 f. οὐκ ἀν τόν γε δύω καὶ εἴκοσ' ἄμαξαι  
     . . . ἀπ' οὐδεος ὄχλισσειαν.

Goodwin, *M. and T.* 162, gives also—

- α 236 f. ἐπεὶ οὐ κε θανόντι περ δᾶδ' ἀκαχούμην,  
     εὶ μετὰ οἷς ἑτάρουσι δάμη.

So that there are 6 cases in the *Od.* against 15 in the *Il.*. But when we examine them, we cannot attach much importance to the difference in numbers. The 13 instances from the *Il.* under (a), (b) and (c) are all of the nature of Homeric formulae. Dr. Leaf notes this on E 311. Nearly all of them occur at very similar junctures, or on the occurrence of very similar incidents, in the course of operations in the field of battle. Had the *Od.* dealt to any extent with such scenes, we might have found the same expressions in it. It should be added here, as regards the three passages from the *Il.* under (a), that it has been proposed to read ἀπόλωλε in E 311, 388, and φέρεν in P 70 (van Herwerden in *Hermes*, xvi. 351 ff.). Bentley had anticipated him (Ludwich *a.l.l.*). See also Goebel, *Hom. Blät.* i. 10, n. 33.

But it seems to be extremely doubtful whether the poet thought of these cases in the past time at all. The authorities differ in their views. Thus on E 311 Dr. Leaf says “the opt. is in itself merely concessive or potential, without reference to past or present.” In his Translation of the *Iliad* he renders Δ 539 by “would enter in and make light of.” Kühner-Gerth (i. 232) translate many of the sentences by the impf. subj., including one of the two cases in (d), viz. M 58 f., where their rendering of ἐσβαίη would be *inscenderet*,

not *in scendisset*. The other case under (d), B 80 f. = Ω 220 ff., seems to get no attention in this connection, and there is no objection to rendering *φαίμεν* in these two passages by “we might say.” Again, see Goodwin’s account of the matter in *M. and T.* §§ 440 ff., and App. pp. 387 f. He divides the cases into two groups. In the first of these, his definition of which corresponds to Dr. Monro’s of these cases generally, he places only the three cases from the *Il.* in (a) of our list and one from the *Od.*, a 236. The three from the *Il.* can, we have seen, be easily amended. And as to a 236, it is certainly doubtful. Dr. Monro, as we have noted, does not include it. *M. and R.*, in note *a.l.*, translate “I should not grieve,” and that seems to be quite good. Goodwin defines his other group as “potential opts. with *κε* or *ἄν* which seem to belong to the borderland between past and fut. conclusions, and are not definitely fixed in the past (like the apodosis in § 440) by a past tense in the protasis.” These are the majority of the cases not here enumerated. Those which Goodwin does not mention at all are the four of a type in (b) of our list, and B 81. These five he either considers in no way abnormal or as also in the borderland. He sees in these borderland cases a certain looseness of use of the opt., which is well illustrated by his comparison of i 241, one of our Odn. cases, with A 271 and E 303. So that if we follow Goodwin, and if we also, with the authority we have quoted, amend the cases in (a) and reject a 236, we get rid altogether of this peculiar opt. as defined by Dr. Monro. But if it be maintained, then we claim that such difference as there is between the *Il.* and the *Od* in number of instances is easily accounted for.

It seems in all the cases, other than these four doubtful ones, a reasonable alternative to suggest that the poet is bringing a picture before his readers’ or hearers’ eyes vividly, by using language that describes the scene as present before them. In this way, as by other means he makes ἐν μέσοις τοῖς κινδύνοις τὸν ἀκροατὴν δοκεῖν στρέφεσθαι.<sup>1</sup> This seems to be especially the case with our group (c) from the *Il.* The form of speech used in them occurs elsewhere, e.g. γ 124. Nestor is speaking to Telemachus. The context shews that οὐδέ *κε φαίης* means, not “you (Telemachus) would not say,” but “one would not say.” The very form of words itself is common in other poetry. It is often, as in the *Shâhnâma*, “thou wouldest have” or “thou mightst have.” It is often on the borderland; there is the looseness noted by Goodwin in the Homeric cases. Scott’s “might you see,” and Tennyson’s “a man far-off might well perceive, If any man that day were left afield, The hard earth shake,”—which recalls Δ 539 ff.,—are instances. But we have the *φαίης* *κε* form itself, as in an Irish epic (*Cornhill Mag.* 1908, 499), “you would think it was with *partaing* her lips were adorned. You would think it was a

<sup>1</sup> Περὶ ὕψους, xxvi. One of our pas-

σages, Ο 697, is there quoted, though it is η τῶν προσώπων ἀντιμετάθεσις to which the effect is attributed.

shower of pearls was in her mouth," or Vergil's *migrantes cernas*, *Aen.* iv. 401, with which compare, "upon the eastern bank you see," in *Marmion*, vi. 19. Goebel explains the Homeric cases in this same way (*op. cit.* ii. 6, n. 2),—*der Dichter sich die Handlung lebhaft vergegenwärtigt, sich selbst gleichsam dabei gegenwärtig denkt.*

32. "Optative of concession." Miss Stawell's statement seems conclusive. The greater frequency of speech in the *Od.* accounts for the greater number of cases in that poem. As the use in question is in the first person, it can occur only in speeches. But it may be said of the opt. mood generally, that it is more frequent in speeches. Out of 166 examples of its uses quoted by Dr. Monro in §§ 299-314 of the *H.G.*, 130 are in speeches. We must be careful then how we style an opt. Odyssean. And then the difficulty of classifying opts. as to meaning. The diversity of interpretation is, as every student of the commentaries knows, very remarkable. See *M. and T.* 383 and *n.* Dr. Monro himself (*H.G.* 274) does not seem to be at one with Delbrück as to a number of the cases now under reference. But to take an individual case,—it appears from Dr. Leaf's note on X 253, ἔλοιμι κεν, η̄ κεν ἀλοίην, that he takes both opts. as potential, that Dr. Monro takes both as concessive, and that Hentze takes the first as potential and the second as concessive. Again Goodwin, p. 191, gives quite a different rendering of one of the two leading cases given by Dr. Monro (*Odyssey*, p. 333), β 219, and if we refer to α 288, where the line is repeated with the verb in the *second* person, we see that that is the more natural interpretation. Am.-H. translate some of the instances in a different way from Dr. Monro. On δ 347, *e.g.*, the translation is *non is sum qui dicam*. And on the whole it may be said with certainty that no two interpreters would agree, as to the exact shades of meaning, in a dozen of instances. And lastly it may be observed that in Miss Stawell's list for the *Il.*, not one case appears from the three Odyssean books I, K, Ψ, though speeches abound in them all.

37. "Object clauses with *ei* after verbs of telling, knowing, seeing, thinking, etc." Another case in which there is too nice discrimination of usage. It is classifying very finely to distinguish, in this construction, between verbs of "seeking and desiring" on the one hand and "seeing (if) and thinking" on the other. Verbs of "telling" might be differentiated from the rest, but there is only *one* case, μ 112, in Dr. Monro's list. And again the greater prevalence of speeches in the *Od.* has its effect.

This seems the weakest of the three opt. cases. One peculiarity pervades all Dr. Monro's instances of it. In none of them can it be affirmed that the *ei*-clause comes after the verb, if it be meant thereby that it is directly dependent on it. In seven of the cases the verb governs an accus., and the *ei*-clause follows. In another, ε 420 f., it is at least good to take ὅπως ὡχ' ἀριστα γένοιτο and not the *ei*-clause as

immediately dependent on the verb (*βούλευον*), and in the ninth and last, ε 439, we may with perfect propriety read ἐσ γαῖαν ὄρώμενος in parenthesis, making the ει-clause come after νῆχε παρέξ. In all, except one with οὐδα, § 119, which is paralleled by Λ 792, we supply “in the hope that,”—in σ 375 it would be something different,—just as in cases from the *Il.*, e.g. Δ 88, διζημένη, εἰ πον ἔφεύροι, we translate, with Dr. Monro himself, “seeking Pandarus *in the hope* of finding him.” See *M. and T.* §§ 488 and 491, where some of our passages are thus rendered.—There is not a case of the construction in any of the four Odyssean books of the *Iliad*.

39. μάν and μήν. μάν, *Il.* 22, *Od.* 2; μήν, *Il.* 7, *Od.* 3. There has been much controversy over these forms,—see Ebel., s.v. μήν, and Mutzbauer, *Der. hom. Gebrauch d. Partikel MEN*, 10 ff.,—but not much disposition to regard the difference in the figures for the two poems as due to different stages of the epic language. It is certain that there has been interchange of μάν, μήν and μέν, which are apparently forms of the same particle and equivalent in meaning, and it seems that the origin of the different forms has not yet been cleared up (*H.G.* 312 f. and *Ench.* 89 n.).

40. μὲν οὖν. *Od.* 5, *Il.* 1 (I 550). It should be noted that the combination in Homer is only a strengthened μέν (Kühner-Gerth, ii. 157 f.), and that there is no suggestion of any approach in these occurrences to its special meanings in later Greek. In *Hym. Merc.* 577, there is. The difference between the *Il.* and the *Od.* in this matter is small, and in two of the occurrences in the latter there is a *v.l.*, ἄρ.

42 and 43. *Metre.* See Chap. XIII. *supra*.

47. νῦν. See p. 233 *supra*.

48. οὐδέν. See p. 70 *supra*.

## APPENDIX E

### DIFFERENCES IN THE VOCABULARIES OF THE *ILIAD* AND THE *ODYSSEY*

DR. MONRO, in his enumeration (*Odyssey*, p. 334), excludes words the presence of which in only one poem or the other is due to the peculiar subject matter. See p. 37 *supra*. But of words not covered by this reservation, he discusses "two noteworthy groups."

#### A

The first set in this group are "old poetical words, mostly preserved in certain fixed or traditional phrases, and often (as far as we can judge) only half understood by the poet himself."<sup>1</sup> The first examples are 5 epithets of Zeus, 4 of Apollo, 5 of Ares, 1 of Hera, 1 of Aphrodité, and 3 of horses. But Zeus is mentioned twice as often, Apollo about 5 times as often, Ares more than 10 times as often, Hera 17 times as often, Aphrodité more than twice as often, and ἵππος nearly 10 times as often, in the *Il.* as in the *Od.* It is not surprising then that a few of their epithets in the *Il.* do not recur in the *Od.* For instance, Ares is hardly ever absent from the battles of the *Il.* In the *Od.* his solitary appearance, in the Lay of Demodocus, is in a very different capacity. We note that some of these archaic epithets that do not occur in the *Od.* are found in some of the late "Odyssean" books. Thus μώνυχες is frequent in two of these tainted books, K and Ψ, the reason being that they, unlike the *Od.*, are much occupied with horses. ὑψηλέες occurs only twice in all, once in E and once in Ψ. On the whole, this particular batch of epithets appears to prove nothing.

It is supplemented by a list of 25 general epithets, "old poetical words," found only in the *Il.* But 10 of these, δῆιος, ἀγχέμαχος, ἀγχιμαχητής, ἔχεπευκής (of βέλος, and only twice), κυδιάνειρα (always of μάχη, except once), ταχύπωλος, φιλοπτόλεμος, μενεδήιος, μενεχάρμης and ποδώκης, are of the kind we expect in the *Il.* and not in the *Od.* Much

<sup>1</sup> What is the ground for this statement? It is often repeated, as in *R.G.E.* 214. But I have never seen the reason given.

the same may be said of others, as ὡμηστής, twice in the *Il.* of dogs devouring an enemy's corpse, and twice in Ω; λοίγιος, *Il.* 4, one of the occurrences being in Ψ; ἀλίαστος, *Il.* 7, 5 of them of fighting or its din.—λαιψηρός occurs *Il.* 10 (1 of them in K), 6 of them being with γούνατα, of the quick running of a man pursued,—a rare thing in the *Od.* αἰψηρός, which is only another form, occurs *Il.* 1, *Od.* 2.—μέρμερος, *Il.* 6, always in neut. plur. with ἔργα expressed or understood. Such ἔργα are more common in the *Il.* One occurrence is in Θ, and 3 are in K. This has been made ground of objection to K.—The same may be said of πευκεδανός, for which see p. 65 *supra*.—The remaining words are of a more neutral kind. ἐρεβενός, *Il.* 8 (2 in Θ and I). On the other hand, ἐρεβός in the *Od.*, Θ and I, 7, in the rest of the *Il.* only 1; ἐρεμνός, *Il.* 3, *Od.* 2.—ἔανός, whether subst. or adj., hardly seems claimable. It might rather be quoted against the present contention. Cf. ἐσθής on p. 335 in Monro's statement.—ἐλίκωπες, *Il.* 6 (one of them in Ω), but always of the Ἀχαιοί, who are named five times as often in the *Il.* as in the *Od.* ἐλικώπιδα (*κούρην*) is found only A 98.—πευκάλιμος, *Il.* 4, one of them in Θ, another in the *Apaté*, always in φρεσὶ πευκαλίμοσ. ἐνδον ἔισας (*φρένας*), which seems quite as archaic, is confined to the *Od.* Robert, p. 479 and *n.*, makes πευκάλιμος quite a recent importation into the *Iliad*.—νηπίαχος, *Il.* 3, νηπύτιος, *Il.* 9, are almost confined to Υ and Φ. In eschewing them the *Od.* agrees with the bulk of the *Il.* νήπιος is common in both poems.—ἐλκεσίπεπλος, *Il.* 3, always with Τρῳάδες, which does not occur in the *Od.* Very little can be argued on this group of cases.

Then follow, always in the category of "old poetical words," 4 adverbs and 1 verb. εὐθαρ, *Il.* 9. Of these, 8 are in battle scenes,—5 in descriptions of wounds, and the remaining 3 forming a group by themselves.—ἀνδιχα, *Il.* 5, 3 being in the phrase ἀνδιχα πᾶσα κεάσθη (of a cloven head), which is not required in the *Od.*, and one of the two others in the *Hoplopoenia*. δίχα, from which ἀνδιχα is derived, is found *Il.* 3, *Od.* 7.—For διαπρύσιον see p. 38 *supra*.—ἴπαιθα, *Il.* 6, is at least not widely diffused; 3 in Φ, and 1 in the *Hoplopoenia*. The verbs with which it occurs are much more common in the *Il.*.—χραισμέν, *Il.* 19, is much insisted on. See Friedländer, *Zw. h. W.* 814, and Mure, ii. 494. Many of the occurrences are in respect of the warding off of death, which is a much more frequent event, both in actuality and in contemplation, in the *Il.* than in the *Od.* It is noticeable that there is a very great disproportion between the occurrences in the two poems of the other verbs for "helping." There are in the *Il.* 10 occurrences of ἀμύνω and its compounds, and 7 of ἀλέξω and 40 of ἀργύω, for every 2 in the *Od.* When the occurrences of all these words are scrutinised, the inference to be drawn from those of χραισμέν alone is greatly reduced.

But further, among these "old poetical words" there are a number "which are common in the *Il.*, but so rare in the *Od.* that

they are probably only reminiscences." The latter part of the remark seems to have no real basis. If it means that the words were dying out of use, it is surely not correct, for most of them continued to be used, by Hesiod and other writers. And it is hardly fair to the *Od.* to blame it for not using these archaic words, and then, when it does so, to say they are only reminiscences. This class contains the following:—

*μέροπες*, *Il.* 9, *Od.* 2. Of the former 4 are, strangely enough, in late "Odyssean" books.—*αιγίς*, *Il.* 11, *Od.* 1. In the *Od.* there is less fighting and consequently less opportunity for the mention of the *Aegis*. In the *Mnēstērophonia*, χ 297, it comes in just as in the *Il.* Why "mere reminiscence"? *αιγίοχος* is common in the *Od.*—*ἔφετμή*, *Il.* 9, *Od.* 1. All the occurrences in the *Il.* save one, and the one in the *Od.*, are of divine behests. If one compares the parts played by the gods in the *Il.* and *Od.* respectively, and the number of orders given by them in each to mortal heroes, the difference in the figures causes no astonishment.—*ἥντις* and *ἔντις*, *Il.* 32, *Od.* 7. Of the 32, 12 are in late "Odyssean" books! Eight others are in *ἥντις τε μέγας τε*, which is surely more appropriate to the poem of many sturdy heroes and their exploits. Seven more are in phrases descriptive of Mēriones and Aeneas, who do not appear in the *Od.* As to the *Od.*, with 7 occurrences can we talk of mere reminiscence?—*ἀρητῖφιλος*, *Il.* 27, *Od.* 1. In 20 of the cases in the *Il.* it is used of Menelaus, and that is how it is used in the *Od.* It is an epithet of the class we expect to find in the *Il.*—So for *βροτολογός*, *Il.* 12, *Od.* 1, of Ares.—So also for *ἐκατηβόλος* and *ἀγκυλομήτης*. Particulars are unnecessary.—*ἀγέρωχος*, *Il.* 7, *Od.* 1. Meaning uncertain. Dr. Leaf on B 654 gives 10 etymologies. Of the 7 occurrences in the *Il.*, 2 are in B and K, of Rhodians and Mysians. The other 5 are of the Trojans. These three peoples hardly figure in the *Od.* The *Od.* applies the word to an individual, and it seems at least as likely that the poet knew what he was about as that he was using the word ignorantly for effect.—*δηιόω* and *δηιοτής* need be noticed only in regard to Dr. Monro's remark that the latter bears a new sense in μ 257. But see, e.g., M. and R., Am.-H. and Pierron, *a.l.*—*δαΐφρων*. "In *Il.* from δάις 'strife,' in *Od.* means 'wise' or 'skilful.'" An old, but quite doubtful, distinction originated by Buttmann. Cf. Lehrs, *Kleine Schriften*, 41, and Sitzler, *Āsth. Komm.* *Od.*,<sup>2</sup> 255. M. and R. on α 48 refuse absolutely to accept it. Ebel, *s.v.*, and Nitzsch on α 48 take the word in all cases from δαῆναι. Dr. Monro's dictum is too sweeping. The word must mean the same thing in both *Il.* and *Od.* in the combination *'Οδυσσῆα δαΐφρονα ποικιλομήτην*.—*ἐρίδουπος* and *ἐρίγδουπος*. See p. 38 *supra*.—"The two forms *ἀλεγίζω* (*Il.*) and *ἀλεγύνω* (*Od.*)."*ἀλεγίζω* occurs *Il.* 6, always with a neg., and with a gen., in sense of *curo, respicio*. *ἀλεγύνω*, *Od.* 5, always in *δαῖτα* or *δαῖτας ἀλεγύνειν = curo, procuro, oboe*. The verbs

appear to have become set in their respective phrases.—ἀντικρύ, “only found in the *Od.* in lines adapted from the *Il.*” Quite gratuitous, unless one accepts Dr. Monro’s theory of imitation of the *Il.* by the *Od.*, which I venture to think is unfounded.

## B

“On the other hand the *Od.* shews a marked increase in the words which express what we may call the ideas of civilisation.” Which is surely what we expect in the *Od.*. And see p. 42 *supra*.

Dr. Monro notes especially, as new,

(a) “Words denoting condition or occupation.” *βασίλεια* (queen) and *δέσποινα* (and *ἄνασσα*, we might add) do not occur in the *Il.*. In the *Od.*, 17, 10, 3 times respectively. In 24 out of 30 occurrences, used by a speaker either in addressing or referring to a queen or princess. Such dames play a much less prominent part in the *Il.*, where they come before us more as wives and mothers than as managing households and dealing with dependents. See M. and R. on γ 53. We do not expect Priam, Hector or Paris to use these titles to Hecuba, Andromaché or Helen. In the Achaean camp there is no one of whom they could be used. It cannot be maintained that the *Il.* did not know the words. And if not by the subject, how is the absence of the words from the late “Odissean” lays,—as I and Ω, in which Helen and Agamemnon’s daughters and Kleopatra and Hecuba are referred to,—to be explained?—*δῆμιοεργός*. . It is surely not remarkable that *δῆμιοεργοί* are twice mentioned as a class in the *Od.* and not in the *Il.*—*δοιδός*, common in the *Od.* of course. In the *Il.* only in the “late” *Hoplopoenia* and Ω. B has Thamyris, but it is also “late.” In the Achaean camp there are none. Dr. Leaf, on I 186, admits we do not expect them. Agamemnon certainly left his bard at home, γ 267 f. They were “the appanages of a court, not of a camp” (Jevons, 26). In Troy there are *ἀοιδοί*, Ω 720 ff. But that these are “professional mourners hardly admits of a doubt,”—Leaf, *a.l.* There is a very serious doubt. Professionals in India, for example, wail and beat their breasts. They do not sing an *ἀοιδή*. In China they are called “dogs of the devil”; they “weep and howl.”—*θῆτες*, *Od.* 1, *Il.* 0. *θητέω*, *Od.* 2, *Il.* 1. One would think the custom of working for pay must have been familiar long before it got into the legend in Φ 444. But the mere enumeration of occurrences is enough here.—*πτωχός*, *πτωχεύω*, frequent in *Od.* So *ἄλη*, *ἄλημων* and *ἄλητης* (and -ένω). *κεχρημένος*, *Od.* 8, *Il.* 1. These words, except *κεχρημένος*, which is a mere ptep., and in a category by itself, hardly appear in the *Od.* at all till ξ, when Odysseus appears as a beggar in Ithaca. The words are used when there is occasion for them. See Friedländer, *op. cit.* 754. Is it argued that beggars were unknown in the days of the *Troica*? The poet of δ 242 ff.

thought differently.—*γείτων*, *Od.* 3, *Il.* 0. We do not wonder. See Friedländer, 789.—Nor is it strange that *ἀλλόθροος* is used, in the poem of the Great Wandering, four times of outlandish tribes and peoples.

(b) "Words expressing moral and intellectual qualities." The list is meagre and the occurrences few in number. The greater frequency of those denoting *moral* qualities in a poem the plot of which is described by Dr. Monro himself, p. 336, as "a contest between right and wrong," is hardly worth dwelling on.—*θεονδής*, *Od.* 6, *Il.* 0, 4 of the former in a formula, always in Odysseus' mouth, embodying a reflection very natural at various stages of his adventures.—*ἀνάρσιος*, *Od.* 5, *Il.* 1 (Ω 365), is open to the same remark. Four of the Odyssean instances are in a similar utterance. *ἄγνος*, *Od.* 5, *Il.* 0, 4 of the occurrences being as *epith. ornans* of Artemis or Persephoné. Moral or intellectual advance has apparently little to do with them, or with the use of *ἄγνη* once with *έορτή*. Festivals are rarely mentioned.—*ὅσιη* twice in the *Od.*, *εὐνομίη* once. On the latter see Friedländer, 759. As to the former, a most apposite quotation is given for it, *θεονδής* and *ἄγνος*, by Miss Stawell, p. 107 f., regarding the use of "pious" in Shakespeare's works.

Intellectual qualities are represented by *πινυτός*, *Od.* 6, *Il.* 0, *περίφρων*, *Od.* 54, *Il.* 1, and *ἀποφώλιος*, *Od.* 4, *Il.* 0. But *πινυτή*, H 289, *πινύσσω*, Ε 249, and *ἀπινύσσω* (or *πινύσσω*), O 10. *περίφρων* is found in E 412, which is not modern, used of a lady, just as it is in the *Od.* of Eurykleia 4, and of Penelopé 50 times. It is in fact almost the exclusive property of Penelopé, who is not mentioned in the *Il.* This group of words proves little.

"Some words that denote states of mind" are added,—*δύη*, *Od.* 4, *ἐλπίς*, *Od.* 2, *ἐλπωρή*, *Od.* 4. Again the occurrences are instructive. All those of *δύη* have reference to the hardships endured by Odysseus, and the other two words are used, each in identically recurring phrases, of the final consummation of the hero's return and the end of his sufferings. The same poet might well, in a later poem, use new terms for new themes, and repeat them whenever the narrative reverts to the same circumstances. Cf. *θεονδής* and *ἀνάρσιος*, *supra*.

The "greatly increased use" of the following words is noted:—*δίκαιος*, *Od.* 13, *Il.* 3, which is much what we should expect. Four of the occurrences in the *Od.* are in one of the appropriate formulae referred to *supra* on *θεονδής* and *ἀνάρσιος*.—*ὅπις*, *Od.* 4, *Il.* 1, 3 of the former of the Wooers. But *ὅπίζομαι*, *Od.* 3, *Il.* 2, may be mentioned.—*ὑβρίς*, *-ίξω*, *-ιστής*, *Od.* 26, *Il.* 4. Twenty-one of the Odn. occurrences are of the Wooers and their creature Melanthius. In the *Il.*, *ὑβρίς* twice in A, and *ἔφυβρίξω* once in I, of the insolence of Agamemnon. No further comment on the distribution of the words is necessary.—*ἀθέμιτος* and *-τις*, *Od.* 6, *Il.* 1. Add *θεμιτεύω*, *Od.* 2, *Il.* 0. Of the occurrences in the *Od.*, 3 refer to the Cyclops and his fellows. But

*θέμις* and *θέμιστες* are common enough in the *Il.* The latter occurs even in A.

(c) "Social progress is indicated by new words."—*χρήματα*, "partly replacing the older *κτήματα*." The occurrences are κτ., *Od.* 41, *Il.* 18, χρ., *Od.* 15, *Il.* 0. The interchange of the two words in the MSS. has often been remarked. "The *Il.* may formerly have had *χρήματα* in many places where is now read *κτήματα*" (Friedländer, 806, 814; cf. Monro, crit. n. on ν 120, and see Agar on θ 352, and Mure, ii. 493). And we cannot be certain that it is correct to say *κτήματα* is the older. Much has been written about these words. One remark may be added. 14 of the 18 occurrences of *κτήματα* in the *Il.* refer—12 of them in the negotiations in Γ and Η—to the property carried off by Paris. The word once used in this connection was naturally enough kept in it. Its importance is thus less than it would have had its use been more diffused. *κτῆσις* is rather more frequent in the *Il.* than in the *Od.*—*πρῆξις*, "business," *Od.* 5, *Il.* 0. (Seymour, *Life*, 284, rather "errand" than "trade.") In Ω 524 it is "accomplishment," "effect," which is the meaning in 2 of the 5 Odn. occurrences. In the other 3 it does mean "business" or "errand," 2 of them being in one of the formulae peculiarly appropriate to the poem of adventurous wandering. But apart from this, in which poem should we *a priori* expect business to be more frequently mentioned?—*ἐσθής*, *Od.* 15, *Il.* 0 (*ἐσθος*, Ω 94). One is no more surprised than at finding *ἡνίοχος* -εύς -εύω, *Il.* 33, *Od.* 1, or *τεύχεα* more than 5 and *ἔντεα* more than 14 times as often in the *Il.* as in the *Od.* Will it be said that no word for dress in general had been evolved in *Ur-Ilias* times?—*οἵμη*, *Od.* 3, *Il.* 0, and *ὕμνος*, *Od.* 1, *Il.* 0, scarcely require remark. Two of the occurrences of *οἵμη* and the solitary one of *ὕμνος* are in θ, where we have much of a bard's singing.—Increased use of *δλβος*, *Od.* 8, *Il.* 2, *δλβιος*, *Od.* 14, *Il.* 1 (but add *δλβιόδαιμον*, Γ 182). *τέχνη*, *Od.* 7, *Il.* 1, *τεχνάομαι*, *Od.* 3, *Il.* 1, *τεχνήεις*, *Od.* 2, *Il.* 0, *τεχνηέντως*, *Od.* 1, *Il.* 0. Naturally. But how little weight is to be given to these distributions is shewn by the fact that *τέκτων* is found *Od.* 5, *Il.* 7, *κλυτοτέχνης*, *Il.* 3, *Od.* 1, *κακότεχνος*, *Il.* 1, *Od.* 0, and *τεκταίνομαι* and compounds, *Il.* 3, *Od.* 1. *σοφίη* occurs only in the *Il.*, Ο 412,—of the skill of a shipwright.

(d) "Note also *φήμη*, *φήμις*, *φάτις*, *κλερδών*,—terms expressing the mystery of 'word' or rumour." Of these words the second and third occur in the *Il.* But it is not easy to see how the mystery referred to is to be connected with "ideas of civilisation." It may be noted that *ώστα* occurs in the *Il.*, and that the mystery of the written, which is later than the spoken word, and which is certainly an evidence of increase of civilisation, is found referred to only in Z 168 ff.

And some other words confined to the *Iliad*:—*κάλλιμος* (= *καλός*), *Od.* 6, *Il.* 0, *πολυνήρατος*, *Od.* 4, *Il.* 0, *νόστιμος*, *Od.* 14, *Il.* 0, *ἐπηετανός*,

*Od.* 8, *Il.* 0, ἀδευκῆς, *Od.* 3, *Il.* 0, νήπιονος, *Od.* 8, *Il.* 0, and the form ἔξῆς (in the *Il.* always ἔξείης). The etymology of κάλλιμος and καλός has not been cleared up (L. Meyer, *Handbuch*, ii. 419, 422). It may yet be proved that the former is the older. G. Meyer, *Gr. Gram.* 66, contends that the genuine Homeric form is καλλός,—from καλφός (Prellwitz, 205, and Schultze, 81, 114). Perhaps it is an indication of the same thing that quite a number of Homeric epithets, having all the appearance of antiquity, and many proper names, commence with the form καλλι-. In Z 321, Bekker conjectured περὶ κάλλιμα for περικαλλέα.—πολυνήρατος and ἀδευκῆς are both comparatively rare.—νόστιμος is strangely singled out. It occurs almost exclusively in the phrase νόστιμον ἡμαρ, used of the salvation which Odysseus is believed to have lost. This is as natural in the poem of the great Νόστος as that νόστος and νοστέω are more frequent in it than in the *Il.*—ἐπηετανός. See the occurrences, and reflect that the *Od.* is the poem in which one expects to find descriptions of the comforts of a home and its surroundings.—νήπιονος, always of the Wooers' reckless waste. Another instance of repetition, in thoroughly Homeric style, of a word once used in a particular connection. ποινή occurs *Od.* 1, *Il.* 10.—Lastly, ἔξῆς, *Od.* 7, *Il.* 0, and ἔξείης, *Od.* 17, *Il.* 6. It is striking, at first sight, that the *Od.*, while it uses the Iliadic form freely, has one of its own. But see p. 38 *supra*.

## APPENDIX F

### ITERATIVE VERBS, AN AND ES

SOME authorities find in the use of Iterative verbs a sign of lateness. Robert (162 and *n.*, and *passim*) considers them "Ionisms," and indicative of the late origin of I and other parts. For K, he will not stoop to proof of the same origin for it. Bechtel (*Vocalcontr.* 3) takes the same line, and notes ἔξερύσασκε, K 490. Liesegang (*De XXIV. Il. rhapsod.* 7) remarks, without pressing the point, how numerous these verbs are in Ω. He then gives a list, which shews that K has fewer than any other book of the *Il.* except M. It has in fact only ἔξερύσασκε certain. In 489, there is a *v.l.* πλήγασκε for πλήγειε. For ἀγέθεσσον, 493, see Ludwich, *a.l.*, and Vogrinz, 116.

The commentaries are silent regarding these forms. I have discovered no adverse remark in Dr. Leaf's edition. Curtius (*Verb*, chap. xxii.) gives no sign that they are late. See also *H.G.* 47 f., *Ench.* 360 f., Kühner-Blass, ii. 79 ff., Vogrinz, *l.c.*, etc. One high authority, Bréal (*Journ. d. Savs.* 1903, 143, reviewing *Stud. z. Il.*) disputes Robert's view of these verbs, *considérés bien gratuitement comme des ionismes*. He refers to his own paper on the subject in *Mélanges Perrot*, which I have not seen. See also his *Pour mieux*, 228 ff.

The forms abound throughout the poems, and Curtius does not envy the stickler for uniformity who should seek to purge them away. Mr. Agar would even restore φάεσσκε in ε 279 = η 268. If there are 10 in I, there are 11 in Α and 10 in X, both *Mēnis*. And certainly K is open to no imputation. The one case in it is derived from the aor. in -σα, and Dr. Monro says, *l.c.*, that these "are only found in Homer." Fick himself (*Iliad*, 477) admits that "coarse Ionisms" are not common in K; so I, according to Robert's view, and K, according to Fick's, do not hang together in this respect. Fick adds that the Ionisms in K are found as a rule in parts which betray themselves on other grounds as late additions. Now, according to him,—see p. 221 *supra*,—K 5-16 is such an addition, and it has been pointed out in *C.Q.* iv. 77, that 9-16 gave the interpolator a splendid

opportunity for the employment of this particular Ionism. But not one of the many verbs in these lines has the iterative form.

Every reader of Robert's *Studien* knows what ample use is made of these Iteratives to discredit passages. An Ionic *Bearbeiter* or Interpolator could hardly write a line without introducing them. Then how could an Ionic write the 579 lines of K and stumble but once? Again, take the case of M. It was, according to Robert (p. 153), composed after the original *Iliad* had already received "Ionic additions." Yet in his enumeration (p. 151) of the "Ionisms" in M he does not give one Iterative. These verbs seem useless as a test,—as useless as  $\ddot{a}v$ ,  $\dot{e}s$  or *F*.

As regards  $\ddot{a}v$ , some references to the controversy which its presence in the poems has aroused have been given p. 221 *supra*. The question may some day be settled, if Dr. Monro has not already settled it, but we need not go into it. It suffices for our purpose to say that  $\ddot{a}v$  is found in K only 5, as against  $\kappa e$ , 23 times. In 4 of these places it can be replaced by  $\kappa ev$  (in 63,  $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\acute{e}i\,\kappa'$  for  $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\acute{e}i\nu$ , *H.G.* 329), and in the fifth  $\dot{\omega}s\,\delta'\,\dot{\delta}\pi\acute{o}t'$  or  $\dot{\omega}s\,\delta\acute{e}\,\pi\acute{u}k'$  (p. 221 *supra*) can be read. So the presence of  $\ddot{a}v$  does not help the Ionistic School against K. It is nowhere *fest*.

There remains their third resource, the form  $\dot{e}s$ . They proceed on the assumption that wherever  $\dot{e}s$ , whether the simple word or in a compound, or  $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\omega$ , is metrically certain, there we have Ionic work. The grounds for this are (Bechtel<sup>1</sup> in Robert's *Stud.* 259 f.), (1) that Aeolic had, *so far as we know*,—an important qualification,—only the form  $\dot{e}s$ , while Ionic in the Lyric age had both  $\dot{e}s$  and  $\dot{e}is$ ; and (2) a comparison of occurrences in A and  $\Omega$ . Statistics for other parts of the poems are not regarded. This comparison shews that A has only 3 cases of  $\dot{e}s$  certain, 2 of which are in suspicious passages, while the third, A 222, can be amended. In  $\Omega$  there are 12,—10 of  $\dot{e}s$  and 2 of  $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\omega$ , or, including repetitions, 14. A number of these can be amended, some with a certain amount of MS. support, but apparently that indulgence is to be reserved for A, and not to be extended to  $\Omega$ . So the book of the *Ur-Ilias*, as in Bechtel's judgment it ought to stand, has no blemishes of the kind, while  $\Omega$  has many. This is held to confirm the belief that  $\dot{e}s$  was the Aeolic form, and that  $\dot{e}s$  is late Ionic.

The philological question may be left to the philologists. No reference is given by Bechtel to any discussion of the point. But I notice that his view is controverted in *Ench.* 534, and that there is nothing to support it in the statement in Kühner-Blass, i. 247 f. It may also be observed that it assumes that  $\dot{e}s$  has been substituted for  $\dot{e}is$  in a large number of places in the poems, outside the tracts assigned to days when the Ionians were active; but it is perhaps possible that modernisation has taken place on this scale. But as to the argument

<sup>1</sup> And cf. his *Vocalcontr.* viii. ff.

from the difference between A and Ω, it seems reasonable to insist on a larger view of the occurrences. The inference is that A was composed in Aeolic in a remote age, while Ω was the work of a late Ionian poet. But if this be the reason why Ω is disfigured by this Ionism, how are we to explain the fact that other books which are held to be late Ionian additions, have as few examples of it as the books of the *Ur-Ilias*? K has only one case, χεῖρας ἐσ ἀμάσ, 448, which can be amended, as easily as Bechtel amends A 222, by reading χεῖρας ἐμεῖο, which Eustathius in fact gives. I has only δενδίλλων ἐσ (έφ'?) ἔκαστον, 180, and οὐδὲ σσ' ἐσ (όσα or σσο'?) Ὁρχομενόν, 381. As for Ψ, it has, in its 897 lines, only one phrase, θῆκ' ἐσ ἀγῶνα φέρων, 799 and 886, where, comparing 617, ἀν' ἀγῶνα might be suggested. The first nearly 800 lines of the book furnish no instance. The four books α-δ of the *Telemachy* supply together only 6 cases, some easily removable. In the "Continuation" of the *Odyssey* there are only 2,—ἐσδέσθην, ω 101, and η καὶ ἐσ Ἡλιδα, ω 431, where ἐFιδέσθην and η εἰσ have been proposed. We could understand that a single late book might chance to escape this particular Ionian taint, or not to exhibit it to a great extent. But here we have over 5000 late Ionian lines with only 13 occurrences, and they may be cleansed of them almost entirely, if we are allowed to amend as in A. How is it, if those in Ω are to be put down to its Ionian origin, that all these other books, said to be of the same stamp, really attach themselves, in respect of ἐσ, to the books of the *Kern*? The preferable explanation seems to be that the subject of Ω happened to require a number of expressions in which ἐσ remains a short syllable, and a perusal of the instances, which are given in full by Bechtel, l.c., will confirm it.

ἐσ is certain, if my counting be correct, in only 144 places in the 27,802 lines of the poems. The *Odyssey* has, proportionally, more instances than the *Iliad*, 71 against 73, but then it uses the preposition three times for every two occurrences in the *Iliad*. The two poems are once more in exactly similar case. And the distribution in each is very uniform. Ω is the only book that has more than 7. Of the other 47 books, 31 have either three, two, one or none. If there were anything in the test, the proper conclusion would seem to be that Ω is the only Ionian book in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Professor Smyth (*Ionic*, 601) says "Fick's attempt (*Ilias*, 537 ff.) to exclude the Ionic ἐσ from the Homeric epos is a failure. His allegiance to an Aeolic εἰσ is purchased at the price of emending many passages in the (*se judice*) older books, and by regarding the unassailable cases of ἐσ as substitutes for an (original) Kyprian ἵνα. Wecklein, *Curae epigraph.* 59, concludes that Homer and the other epic poets have εἰσ in passages metrically authoritative."

In the Bechtel-Robert scheme a number of other usages are stigmatised as Ionisms which, so far as I can ascertain, are not

generally so regarded. I will add a word regarding only one, the dat. pl. of the 2nd. decl., as the statistics are puzzling there also. I uses that dat. no fewer than 80 times, and it is *never once* the modern short form. Ø gives much the same results. van Leeuwen by two small amendments removes the only two blemishes in 61 occurrences.

## APPENDIX G

### LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES OF K

THE peculiarities in the language of K which remain to be enumerated are the following :—

#### I. ἀπαξ λεγόμενα.

ἀλεξίκακος, 20. There is nothing remarkable in its form (Bréal, 215), or in its use with *μῆτις*. Cf. I 423 f. Its solitary occurrence is not more noteworthy than the similar ἀ. λλ., ἀλεξάνεμος and ἀρχέκακος. ἀλέξειν κακὸν ἥμαρ occurs thrice in the *Il.* Dr. Monro (*H.G.* 118) classes the epithet with others of “an archaic stamp,” which (p. 40 *supra*) are characteristic of the *Il.* rather than the *Od.*

Θύμβρη, 430. Surely hardly worth mentioning. Θυμβραῖος, Λ 320.

πατρόθεν, 68. The suffix had a wide range of use (Kolbe, *De suff.* ΘΕΝ *usu Hom.*), and could be attached freely to nouns, adjs. and verbs. A number of others are ἀ. λλ., as ἀλόθεν, ποντόθεν, λειμωνόθεν, πεδόθεν, δημόθεν and

νειόθεν, 10, which is well supported by νειόθι, Φ 317, and (Leaf) νέατος, I 153, and νέάτος, Z 295.

ἀλαλύκτημαι, 94. Friedländer refers to ἀλύσσω, X 70.

τριστοιχί, 473, vouched by τρίστοιχος, μ 91, where Mr. Agar thinks τριστοιχί may be the true reading, and μεταστοιχί, Ψ 358. Friedländer (*Zw. h. W.* 752) notes that many words compounded with numerals occur only once.

ὑπόρρηνος, 216. Orszulik remarks that elsewhere, as Λ 681, δ 636, ι 245 = 309 = 342, a sentence is used to describe an animal with its young!—Note that in this case K eschews the practice of the *Od.* and the “Odyssean” story of Nestor in Λ.

δουρηνεκές, 357. Like διηνεκής, in both poems, and ποδηνεκής, K 24, 178, and O 646. Another instance of the poet finding it convenient to say in one word what is elsewhere,—O 358, etc., described by a sentence.

κεμάς, 361, which occurs in a simile, hardly requires notice.

## II. Meanings.

*φρένες*, 10, "instead of ὑπορ,"—Orszulik, following LaRoche; elsewhere, = *praecordia*. A strange statement. Pierron's *le dia-phragme, dans son sense propre*. *Les entrailles d'Agamemnon tressaillent* seems to state the case correctly.

*τεκταίνομαι*, 19, with *μῆτιν* = "devise a plan," the common phrase being *ὑφαίνειν μ.* But *φράξεσθαι* and *εύρυσκειν* (once) are also used. *τεκταίνομαι* recurs E 62, of shipbuilding. May a verb not be used in a figurative sense? Milton only once uses "build the lofty rhyme." We have *παρατεκταίνομαι*, Ξ 54 and § 131, with just as much deviation in sense as in our passage.

*προφέρειν* (*μένος*), 479, "display courage." Commentators compare *ἔριδα προφέρονται* and *προφέροντες*, Γ 7 and ζ 92. Add ἔρ. *προβαλόντες*, Λ 529. But Orszulik, perhaps rightly, claims a slightly different meaning in 479.

*ἀσθμαίνω*, which, like *ἀσθμα*, occurs only in the *Il.*, is, it is said, elsewhere = "rattle in the throat" (of the wounded and dying). So E 585, II 826, N 399, Φ 182. In K, on the contrary, = "pant," "gasp,"—376, of a runner, 496, of a sleeper. But Ebel. omits the rattle and gives the general meaning, *aegre et graviter spiritum duco, ut morientes aut qui diu cucurrerunt*. In II 826, of a boar overcome by a lion, "gasp" is quite suitable.

*ἵππων ἐπεβήσετο*, 513, 529, = "mounted (one of) the horses." Elsewhere of getting into a car. It is argued, pp. 276 f. *infra*, that the latter is the meaning in K also.

*ὅρνυμι*, 518, = "waken out of sleep." That goes too far. Apollo did waken Hippokoön, but by *ὤρσεν* the poet does not say so. He completes his statement later by adding *ό δ' ἐξ ὑπνου ἀνορούσας*. Ebel. gives 518 under the meaning *impello, treibe an*.

*ἐπὶ φρένα φῆχ'* (*v.l. εἰχ'*) *ιεροῦσιν*, 46, *animum advertit sacris*. But it does not seem to be the meaning that is strange here, but the combination of words that is unique.

*πλάγομαι*, 91, "I am helpless, distracted," following the Schol., *πλανῶμαι κατὰ γνώμην*, and LaRoche. Better "I am wandering here because I cannot sleep" (Leaf, *a.l.*). So Seiler, Am.-H., and *Ench.* 466. Ebel. quotes Curtius as translating *vagor*, but with the unnecessary addition, *etsi recte Nestoris tentorium petit Agamemno*.

*ἐρύκω*, 161, = *separo*, in *οὐλίγος δ' ἔτι χῶρος ἐρύκει*, of the Trojans. But Am.-H., "keeps them off," surely correctly. The object understood must be a pronoun to represent *Τρῶας*, and *separat* does not give sense. There is a *v.l. ἀπὸ χῶρος ἐέργει*.

*λόφος*, 573. Its only use in Greek of the neck of a human being (Leaf, *a.l.*, and cf. Jebb on *Antig.* 292). Dr. Leaf also observes that it is oddly interposed between *κνήμας* and *μηρούς*. Perhaps in 573 it

includes more than the neck, possibly the back "from nape to rump." Cf. its use = "ridge (of a hill)," and the words *λοφιή* and *καταλοφάδια*.

*λεπτός*, 226, "only here and Ψ 590 (the same phrase) in a metaphorical sense." The use is thus not peculiar to K.

*ἄναξ*, 559, = "master." Dr. Monro notes, rare in *Il.* See passages such as M 413, II 371, Ψ 517, Ω 734, and for dat. following, E 546, N 452, Y 230. It is often, e.g. N 28, 38, difficult to pronounce between "lord" and "master." S. and A. (*Hym. Ap.* 234; cf. Fanta, *Der Stadt*, 27 ff.) call the latter sense "Homeric." It is relevant to ask what other common word could have been used in 559.

*αὐδήσαντος*, 47, "'by word of mouth,' whereas by the usual Homeric practice it should mean 'I never heard any one speaking'" (Leaf, *a.l.*). So Dr. Monro,—*αὐδάω* elsewhere = *loquor*, not *dico*. But in the formula *αὐδα ὅτι φρονέεις*, it is surely *dico*. And if in our passage, which runs *οὐδ' ἔκλυνον αὐδήσαντος ἄνδρ' ἔνα . . . μητίσασθαι*, we take, with Ebel., *s.v.* *αὐδάω*, the acc. and inf. as governed by *ἔκλυνον*, there is no difficulty in taking *αὐδήσαντος* in the sense said to be required by Homeric practice.

### III. Forms.

*καλήμεναι*, 125. Other similar forms are *φορ-* *φιλ-* *πενθ-* *ποθήμεναι*. Their origin is doubtful,—Monro on π 333 and *H.G.* 20; *Ench.* 435 f.; Bekker, *Hom. Blät.* i. 50, 147; Schulze, 17; and Solmsen, 17.

*καταβείομεν*, 97, noted by Orszulik. Many editors accept *καταβήσομεν*. See *H.G.* 384 ff., and Christ, *Iliad*, 149.

*πεπίθοιτο*, 204, peculiar only in this that the reduplicated 2 aor. *mid.* of this particular verb does not recur. For similar formations see Curtius, *Verb*, 293, *H.G.* 39, and *Ench.* 348.

*ἀπὸ στρατόφι*, 347, in Orszulik's enumeration without any comment. It is true it occurs only here. But so *ἀπὸ χαλκόφι* and *ἀπὸ ναῦφι*; and *ἀπὸ στήθεσφι* only twice.

*χαρέντες*, 541. Elsewhere in the same sense, Orszulik says *γηθόσυνος*. But there seems to be the same difference between the two as between *gaudentes* and *laeti* (Schmidt, *Synon.* No. 126), between joy manifested and gladness felt. That the 2 aor. ptcp. pass. occurs only once is not remarkable. The *Index Homericus* will provide many such cases.

And two forms, besides *θήκατο* and the perfs. in *-κα*, for which see pp. 67 and 68 f. *supra*, which, though not confined to K, are rare outside it:—

*τιθήμενον*, 34, for which *τιθήμεναι*, Ψ 83 and 247, is compared. The result of much discussion seems to be that it is *τιθέμενος*, a form impossible for the hexameter, with the first syllable lengthened *metri gratia*. Paley, *a.l.*, says "for *τιθέμενον*," which Fick gives in his text. See Leaf, *a.l.* (quoting Schulze, 16), and on II 145, Solmsen, 16;

Curtius, *Verb*, 340; *H.G.* 17; Seymour, *L. and V.* 75; and van Herwerden, *Hermes*, xvi. 365. Dr. Monro, *Introduction* to K, says the form is “perhaps” pseudo-archaic, and Menrad, 159, seems to think it due to false analogy. In any case we cannot argue lateness. The form apparently served its purpose for the epic hexameter and did not continue into later Greek.

*μεθιεῖ*, 121, is an indication of lateness according to Dr. Monro in his *Introduction*. But reading Dr. Leaf’s note on E 880 and *H.G.* 19, with note, one gathers that there is no certainty about this.

*κάρη*, in *ρύεται δὲ κάρη θαλερῶν αἰξηῶν* (of the *κατατυξίς*), 259, is taken as a plural by Witte, *Sing. u. Plur.* 88. Surely a misunderstanding of Homeric practice. See *H.G.* 159.

#### IV. Phrases and Combinations of Words.

These include cases in which an epithet is used of a certain person or thing only in K. But such solitary occurrences are common. It is enough to mention *έκατηβελέταο*, *Λητοῦς καὶ Δώς νιός* and *ἡδυεπής* in A. The point is discussed by Friedländer, *Zw. h. W.* 758 and 774 ff. See also Franke, *Nom. propr.* 43 n. Epithets were often *ad rem forte narratam adaptata*. But when he goes on to say, *ibid.* 53, that only the late poets *traditum in epithetis addendis morem laedunt*, we join issue at once. The chief charge against them is that they were imitators and plagiarists. The Higher Criticism cannot be allowed to have it both ways.

The following are such epithets in K:—

*νηλέι δεσμῷ*, 443. Two of six other epithets of *δεσμός* are of single occurrence, *θυμαλγής*, χ 189, and *χαλεπός*, E 391.

*ἄμφηκες*, with *φάσγανον*, only 256. (But φ. *ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἀκαχμένον*, χ 80, comes near.) Elsewhere *ξίφος* ἄ., but only three times in all. Moreover *ξίφος* and *φάσγανον* appear to be convertible, as in A 190, 194, and Y 476, 481 (Ostern, *Bewaffg.* 78 ff.).

*ἀγγήνορες* (*Τρῶες*), 299, nowhere else of the Trojan or any other people. *ἄλκιμοι*, Λ 483, and *εὐηγενέων* or *εὐηφενέων*, Ψ 81, are in exactly the same case. *ἀγγήνορας* in K 299 is very appropriate, almost = “bumptious.” See Hector’s speech in Θ, especially 532-541, and 542, 553. The scholiast says *ὑπερηφανίας μεστὸς ὁ λόγος*. Cf. Albracht, *Kampf u. Kampfsch.* ii. 8.

*καταθητοὶ ἄνδρες*, 440. Elsewhere *κατ.* *ἄνθρωποι*, but only once in the *Il.* *ἄνδρες* and *ἄνθρωποι* are largely, and *θνητός* and *καταθητός* entirely, convertible terms.

*ἐνέξον δόρυν*, 373. See p. 67 *supra*.

*ποικίλος δίφρος*, 501. The epithet is very common with *ἄρματα*. Quite a number of the other epithets of *δίφρος* are used with it only once.

ἔμπεδον ἥτορ, 94. Elsewhere only with *νόος* (once), *μένος* (twice), *ἴσ,* *βίη,* *φρένες*,—a list which seems to supply good reason why the epithet *should* be used with *ἥτορ*.

Objection of a different kind is taken to

*ἄλιος*, used of a person only in 324, *ἄλιος σκοτός*. But *ἄλιος στρατός*, Δ 179, may be referred to. *στρατός* is, in Homer, *longe potissimum (semper, ut putat Ameis) exercitus* (Ebel., s.v.). *L'armée non pas à terre, mais vivante et agissante* (Bréal, 287). Cf. Ξ 455, *ἄλιον πηδῆσαι ἄκοντα*, and Dr. Leaf's note, "dart spoken of as an animate being." In K 324 he suggests, comparing *ἄλαοσκοπιή*, that *ἄλαος* may be the right reading.

*δεινὰ ὅπλα*, 254, 272. It is remarked that *δεινός* is elsewhere applied to some particular piece of armour, as in H 245, Y 259 (*σάκος*), Ξ 385 (*ἀρρ*), E 739, O 309 (*αἰγίς*). Considering the circumstances in K, we are not surprised that the two heroes' equipment is not graced by such a description as *περικαλλέα τεύχεα* or *ἐντεα παμφανώντα*. In their proper places the poet knows and uses the stock phrases,—see 34, 75, 407, 504.

The remaining combinations are

*στόμα πολέμου*, 8. Dr. Leaf calls it "curious." Other editors quote T 313, and *ἰσμίνης στόμα*, Y 359.

*ἄμαδις κυκλήσκετο*, 300. Cf. *ἄμ. καλέσασα* (with the best MSS.), Y 114, and *ἄμ. κάθισαν*, δ 659, of just such informal assemblages. The Trojans' *ἄγορή* was in Θ. Their later meeting was an *ἄγυρις* as contrasted with an *ἄγορή* (M. and R. on γ 31).

*παρὲκ νόον ἡγαγεν* (*v.l. ἡπαφεν*), 391. The whole phrase does not recur in Homer. Nor does, we might say, *κλέπτε νόῳ*, A 132. *παρὲκ νόον* is found, Y 133. See Dr. Leaf on Ω 434.

*ἀρτύνεσθαι βουλήν*, 302. See B 55.

*ἔλκετο χαίτας ιψόθ'* *ἔοντι Διῖ*, 15 f., to Dr. Leaf an unusual and involved form of expression. See Monro and other editors *a.l.*, comparing *Διῖ χεῖρας ἀνασχεῖν*.

*ὅτε πέρ τε*, 7. Dr. Leaf, *a.l.*, thinks this combination "should by Homeric analogy bring in some new concomitant circumstance." It appears to be as well suited to an expansion of a statement. It seems = "when," as in its only other occurrence, Δ 259, not "in consequence of which," as Dr. Leaf suggests. He is very hard on everything in the opening simile. There is a variant, *πολλὰς δέ*.

*μύθῳ ἐπιτέλλεαι*, 61. *μύθῳ* is to Dr. Leaf, *a.l.*, superfluous. It may be taken either as = *in deinem Auftrage, Befehle* (LaRoche, so Leaf himself on I 625), or as merely pleonastic, as in its occurrences with *νείκες, ἡνίπαπε, etc.* *ἴδον ὁφθαλμοῖσι* and *ἐκαλέσσατο φωνῇ* come to mind at once as similar pleonasms. See Lechner, *De Pleonasmis Homericis*, I 14 ff.

V. *Constructions.*

*τῷ δ' ἀσπάσιος γένετ' ἐλθών*, 35. Elsewhere *ἀσπάσιος* *ἥλθε*, and Orszulik quotes Θ 488 and three passages from the *Odyssey* where *φαίνω* is used. There is nothing here worth commenting on. It seems wrong to describe this (and other cases below) as “constructions.”

*πονέεσθαι λιπσόμενος*, 117. Orszulik, following LaRoche, “weary oneself with entreaties,” using the analogy of verbs like *κάμνω* and *φθάνω*. This seems to be making a difficulty and spoiling the sense at the same time. The commonly received interpretation is much better. Cf. Sarpedon to Hector, E 490 ff.

*ἔκλυνον αὐδῆσαντος*, 47, where *τίνος* must be supplied. Orszulik remarks that the nearest cases are from the *Od.*, *ι* 497, *γ* 337, and that elsewhere *κλύω* has other constructions, as *ΙΙ* 76, *X* 451, *δ* 831, *κ* 311, 481, *δ* 767. Verbs of hearing have in fact a variety of constructions in Homer. For the omission of the pron., cf. *X* 199, *B* 389, *N* 287, and see Monro on *ω* 108, *ν* 400, *σ* 10, *π* 109, and S. and A. on *Hym. Merc.* 202.

*βουλὰς βουλεύειν* with an inf., 147, 327. Orszulik notes that elsewhere, *Ψ* 78, *Ω* 652, *ζ* 61, *I* 175, the phrase is used absolutely. It may almost be said to be so used in our passages. The infinitives are epexegetic of *βουλάς*. Note that the phrase is absolute in 415, and also that, on Orszulik’s shewing, the construction complained of dissociates K from three “Odyssean” books of the *Il.* and from one book of the *Od.* itself.

*ὅσοι κεκλήσατο βουλήν*, 195. The accus. *des Zieles* without a prep. appears to be found mostly in what Orszulik considers “late” passages, and he quotes numerous instances from both *Il.* and *Od.* See also Dr. Leaf’s notes on K 195 and 268, and *H.G.* 133 f. Cases like *πόλινδε σαύστετον*, E 224, are very similar.

*δππότ’ ἐπὶ Τρώων ἀίσιεν ιόντων*, 189. Orszulik has difficulty in establishing anything unusual. See Leaf, Monro and Paley, *a.l.*

*ὄναρ κεφαλῆφιν ἐπέστη*, 496. Elsewhere *ὄναρ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἔστη*. But that is not said in the cases quoted, *Ψ* 68, *δ* 803, *ζ* 21 and *B* 20. In these Athené, or an *εἰδωλον* or *ψυχή* or *ὄνειρος*, is said to stand over the sleeper.—This is not a peculiar construction; only a variation of phraseology.

*ρίνοῦ ποιητήν*, 262. Düntzer notices that elsewhere *ποιητός* has not a gen. of material after it, but is used absolutely = “well made.” We might refer to H 222, of Aias’ shield, *ὅς οἱ ἐποίησεν σάκος . . . ταύρων ξατρεφέων*, which is like *βοὸς ρίνοῦ τετευχώς*, *μ* 423. But we may suit Düntzer by putting a comma after *ρίνοῦ* and translating “of hide, well made.” Cf. phrases like *χρυσείην*, *εὐτυκτον* and *χάλκεον*, *ἄρρηκτον*, both in the same position in the verse. This seems to accord with epic practice. In *πίκα ποιητοῦ*, *Σ* 608, *ποιητός*

seems to mean simply "made." See Dr. Monro on ν 32 and *Ench.* 325.

There remain only one or two points in Dr. Leaf's commentary. He appears not to attach importance to them. σὺ δέ, 238, with an emphatic σύ γε preceding, said to be very rare. But is σύ γε at all emphatic?—φυλακὰς δ' ἀς εἴρεαι, ηρως, 416, for which Z 396, Ξ 75, 371, are compared. We recall Vergil's *urbem quam statuo restrahest*, and Sophocles' βῆναι κεῖθεν δθεν περ ηκει, which Jebb characterises as "harsher than any example that can be produced."—ηέ περ οδέ (sc. εισίν), 556, instead of ηέ περ τούσδε. ρ 417 affords a similar instance.

## APPENDIX H

### ODYSSEAN DICTION IN K

#### I. Words found only in K and the *Odyssey*.

*κερδαλέος*, K 44, 4 times in the *Od.* But *κερδαλεόφρων*, A 149, Δ 339.

*μεγαλίζομαι*, K 69, ψ 174. In K with, in ψ without, *θυμῷ*. In other circumstances this could be used as a difference between K and the *Od.*

*νιφετός*, K 7, δ 566. Elsewhere *νιφάδες* in the same sense,—4 times in the *Il.* Hardly a correct statement. In these passages, all similes, *νιφάδες* = “snowflakes.” *νιφετός* is snow in general, “snow-fall” or “snowstorm” (Seiler, and Schmidt, *Synon.*, s.v.). In K 7 Zeus is not *τεύχων νιφάδας*.—We might argue affinity with the *Il.*, as *νιφέοις* and *νιφέμεν* occur in it 5 times; in the *Od.* only one of them, and only once.

*φῆμις*, K 207, and 6 times in the *Od.* In K = “common talk,” “what people are saying.” In the *Od.*, different meanings. The nearest to K is ζ 273, where the word means more,—“gossip,” “tittle-tattle.” Compare the uses of our words “tale” and “talk.”

*δόσις*, K 213, and 4 times in the *Od.* But the word is exceptional in the *Od.*, and its 4 occurrences are really reducible to 2. As a set-off, the phrase used with it in the *Od.*, *ὅλιγη τε φίλη τε*, recurs only in A.

*θαλπωρή*, K 223, α 167. Also Z 412.

*δαίτη*, K 217, γ 44, η 50, κ 216. In ρ 220, 377, *δαιτων* might be from either *δαίς* or *δαίτη*. If *δαιτῶν* from *δαίτη* is objected to, read *δαιτέων* with synizesis. Ameis (*Ebel.*, s.v.) thinks it is from *δαίτη*, as *δαίς* in its inflections never has the first syllable *in thesis*. (If so, read *δαίτης* in I 225, and in θ 98 transpose (M. and R. *a.l.*) *δαιτός* and *θυμόν*.) If this is to be taken as a rule for Homer, then *δαίτησι* in K is in accordance with it. *δαίτεσσι*, it may be added, does not occur.

*δόξα*, K 324, λ 344. See p. 119 *supra*.

$\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\xi\epsilon\rho\chi\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ , "pass by," K 344, κ 573; "circumvent," "cheat," ε 104 = 138. But some editors, as M. and R., Hayman and Am.-H., translate "evade," "elude," in κ 573.

$\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\acute{a}\rho\eta$ , K 418 ( $\pi\nu\rho\delta\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\acute{a}\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ ) and 9 times in the *Od.* Had the word occurred 100 times in the *Od.* there would have been no cause for remark.

$\delta\iota\epsilon\pi\tau\mu\alpha\tau\mu\alpha\iota$ , K 425, δ 215. It is a question if the sense be the same. In K, Fick suggests  $\delta\iota\epsilon\kappa\epsilon$ , comparing I 61.

$\dot{\epsilon}\pi\beta\omega\alpha\omega$ , K 463, υ 378 = β 143. In K  $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\omega\omega\sigma\omega\mu\epsilon\theta'$  is read, and supported by one reading in X 254. See Dr. Leaf on the passages in K and X, Dr. Monro on K 463, and *Ench.* 440. There are difficulties about each reading in K.

$\dot{\alpha}\sigma\pi\acute{a}\chi\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ , K 542, and 3 times in the *Od.*, and  $\dot{\alpha}\sigma\pi\omega\omega\tau\mu\alpha\iota$  only in the *Od.* There is more welcoming of guests in the *Od.*

$\dot{\alpha}\kappa\tau\iota\omega\sigma\sigma\iota\mu$ , K 547, λ 16;  $\dot{\alpha}\kappa\tau\iota\omega\iota\mu$ , ε 479, τ 441. It has chanced to be so. We are thankful that K eschews the contracted form.

## II. Meanings.

$\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\omega\kappa\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ . See p. 232 *supra*.

$\mu\epsilon\omega\iota\chi\omega\mu\alpha\iota$  ("go to fetch" a person), K 111, θ 47. The verb is used, though in a slightly different sense, E 148. In K two MSS. have  $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\omega\chi\acute{o}\mu\mu\epsilon\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ .

$\sigma\chi\acute{e}t\mu\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ , in good, admiring sense, "indefatigable," K 164, μ 279. Elsewhere, "hard," "cruel." But there is plenty room for difference of opinion here. It seems better to take the word in K in the commoner sense, with a colloquial modification. *Cum leni opprobrio, non sine admiratione* (Ebel). "'Cruel,' 'hard-hearted,' a playfully ironical way of expressing admiration" (Monro). See also his notes on ν 293, ν 45, and Leaf on X 41.

$\ddot{\alpha}\rho\kappa\mu\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ , "sufficient," K 304, σ 358, in each case with  $\mu\omega\theta\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ . Orszulik admits it may have its ordinary sense, "assured." It is not easy to decide.

$\kappa\alpha\kappa\mu\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ , in "material" sense, "poor," "ugly," "unsightly," K 316, and in passages such as ξ 506, τ 327. And the expression in K is said to be like that in θ 134. It is hardly less like that in A 114 f. Joined, as in K, with  $\epsilon\ddot{\omega}\mu\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ , its sense of "poor," "inferior," is not exceptional. We might compare  $\epsilon\ddot{\omega}\mu\omega\mu\alpha\iota$   $\ddot{\alpha}\rho\mu\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ ,  $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\eta\tau\mu\alpha\iota$ .

$\ddot{\omega}\mu\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ , K 338, = "assembly," as in the *Odyssey*; elsewhere "battle-throng" (Aristarchus' view,—Leaf, *a.l.*, and Lehrs, *Ar.* 144). This is to manufacture a distinction. There is a difference only if by "battle-throng" is meant Orszulik's *Kampfgetümmel* or LaRoche's *Kampfgewühle*. But  $\ddot{\omega}\mu\omega\mu\alpha\iota$  could not bear that meaning in H 183, 186, 218; and in O 588, Σ 603, X 462, etc., the word has nothing to do with battle. In the *Od.*, in its 9 applications to the throng of wooers, there is just such a suggestion of disorder as in the fights of

the *Il.* In θ 216, λ 514, on which see M. and R., it appears to mean “battle-throng,” as in the *Il.* M. and R. refer to K 499. There seems to be no difference in usage between *Il.* and *Od.*, or between K and other books.

### III. *Forms.*

Of 5 mentioned by Orszulik, 3 are mid. verbs, and the remaining 2 are εἰσθα and τοῦσδεστι, for which see pp. 66 f. *supra*. Düntzer adds πρόφρασσα. But see Φ 500, and Agar, 236 f. He would restore the form in ν 359.

### IV. *Combinations of Words.*

Among these are a number of cases of epithets:—

μῆτις ἀμύμων, K 19, i 414. The adj. is said to be generally used of persons. So it is in K,—170. But it is elsewhere applied to things also, τόξον, ἔργα, etc. In K the epithet ἀλεξίκακος almost personifies μῆτις.

θυμὸς τολμήεις, K 205, ρ 284. Similarity probably only verbal. In K the adj. = *audax*, in ρ = *patiens* (p. 167 *supra*).

ἵπουράνιον κλέος, K 212, i 264. *Per contra*, the adj. recurs only in the *Il.*, P 675.

δέξνη ἄκοντα, K 335, § 531. See also Φ 590.

ἔντεα ἀρήϊα, K 407, in the *Od.* frequent. Not so; only ψ 368.

χλαῖνα διπλῆ, K 134, τ 226, and χλ. φοινικόεσσα, K 133, § 500, φ 118, seem hardly worth commenting on.

These epithet cases prove little enough. There remain:—

πουλὺν ἐφ' ὑγρήν, K 27, δ 709. ὑγρή and the form πουλύς are each found elsewhere.

ἐπ’ ἀγκῶνος ὄρθωθείς, K 80, can, Orszulik says, be compared only with the phrase in § 494. There is a resemblance in the first two words, which, however, occur in the *Il.*, II 702, though in a different sense. One might argue affinity with the *Il.* in respect of ὄρθωθείς, which recurs only B 42, Ψ 235.

ἔρχεαι οὖς, K 82, 385, κ 281. οὖς frequently ends a verse in other passages in the *Il.*

νύκτα δὶ’ ὄρφναίνη, K 83, 276, 386, and i 143. But K has twice the alternative combination νὺξ ἀμβροσίη, which occurs *Il.* 2, *Od.* 0.

ὕπνον ἀωτεῦν, K 159, κ 548. It is not remarkable that some expressions relating to night and sleep are found only in K and the *Od.* (p. 131 *supra*).

χρειὼ τόσον ἵκει, K 142, ε 189, β 28. As against this Orszulik himself adds χρειὼ ἵκάνεται, K 118, Λ 610.

λὰξ ποδὶ κινήσας, and εὖ καὶ ἐπισταμένως,—see pp. 116 and 122 *supra*.

ἐπεα πιφαύσκειν, K 202; ἐπος πιφαύσκειν, χ 131 = 247. The meanings are different. πιφαύσκω is common in both poems.

ἄστρα προβέβηκε, K 252, is compared with μετὰ δ' ἄστρα βεβήκειν, μ 312. *Per contra*, προβαίνω, found in 3 other places in the *Il.*, is not in the *Od.*

ῥέοσθαι and φυλάσσειν, joined K 417. Elsewhere only ξ 107, ο 35, —but in reverse order.

#### V. *Constructions.*

τίπτε δέ σε χρεώ, K 85, α 225. But surely Λ 606 comes near enough. It seems unnecessary to quote the remarks of commentators.

ῥέξω with name of animal sacrificed as object, K 292; elsewhere only in the *Od.* But in Λ 727 we have ταῦρον, and Δ 102 is not irrelevant.

ἐπιμαίμαί τινος, "strive after," K 401, ε 344, μ 220; elsewhere with accus., "touch," "handle." But ε 344 has been much discussed. See Agar, 77.

χρυσὸν κέρασιν περιχεύας, K 294, and γ 384, 426, 437 (all three of one operation); and cf. ξ 232. We cannot help it if Homer has to repeat a process. We must take what the poet gives us. I think no one objects to πλυνοί only in X and ζ, or to vermilion on the bows of ships only in B and ι.

τὸν δ' αἰψὺα περὶ φρένας ἥλυθ' ιωῆ, K 139; cf. ι 362 and ρ 261, and similar phrases in π 6, τ 444. But editors also quote Λ 89, 466, B 41.

ἢν δέ τις ἐν Τρώεσσι κ.τ.λ., K 314 ff., and ἢν δέ τις ἐν μνηστήροις κ.τ.λ., ν 287 ff. Orszulik finds the same "order of thought." We have simply a formula. See E 9, B 811, Λ 711, and cf. P 575.

## APPENDIX I

### ILIADIC DICTION IN K

WORDS, ETC., OCCURRING ONLY IN K AND THE OTHER  
BOOKS OF THE *ILIADE*

#### I. Words.

ἀστράπτω, χάλαξα, Τρωϊκός, αὐλός (flute), σύριγξ, προθέλυμνος, ὑψόθι, τεκταίνομαι, ὄρθωθείς, δαφοινός, ποδηνεκής, παρδαλέη, στεφάνη, θραυσκάρδιος, μέρμερος, διύφιλος, φύλα-ξ, -κός, -κή, -κτήρ, ὀπάων, παναίλος, οὔρεύς, ὕκνος, περονάω, ταύρειος, ἐριαύχενες, ἐπίορκον, συλάω, δήϊος, καρχαρόδοντε, ἀσθμαίνω, ζωγρέω, ἅποινα, διασκοπιάσθαι, φλοῖσθος, ἐπίκουρος, ἀγκυλότοξος, ἵπποκορυνσταΐ, Θρῆκες, etc. (in *Od.* only θ 361, in the Lay of Demodocus), μυρίκη, ἐριθηλής, δίξυγες, ἐρυθαίνω, ρυμός, ἀνεψιός, φονή, κυδοιμός, ἔναρα, βροτόεντα; a number of compound verbs, ἀναστεναχίω (-χω), ἐπαείρω, περιδείδω, ἐκθρώσκω, ἀποτρέπω, προβαίνω, ἔντεινω, παραφθάνω, ἀποτμήγω, παρατρέχω, ἐνορούω, ἐπιπλήσσω, διελαύνω, and some verbals, ὄρυκτός, πολύκλητος, ἔντμητος. μώνυχες, χαλκοχίτωνες, μετάφρενον, φόβος and φοβέω, θύνω and ἴδρως are frequent in the *Il.*, but are found in the *Od.* very rarely.

#### II. Forms.

πυρά, δεδεγμένος, ἐγρήγορα, ἔέλπομαι (but see p. 233 *supra*), *Il.* 6, *Od.* 1, ὅρεσφι, φᾶλαι, aor. mid., aor. ἐπάγην, λαιψηρός, ὑπαί, δείοις, the redupl. aor. πεπίθοιτο, δαμήμεναι, μυμνάω, and ἔκερσα, 6 times in the *Il.*, which has also ἔκειρα, the only form the *Od.* knows.

#### III. Meanings and Uses.

ἡθεῖος in voc., and cf. ηθείη κεφαλή, Ψ 94 (in *Od.* only ἀλλά μιν ἡθεῖον καλέω, § 147), ξωστήρ, piece of armour, in § 72 belt for *chiton*, ὅβριμος, of a person, χάρμα, cause of malicious joy in an enemy, κτέρας (sing.), possession, μοῖρα, in *Od.* always portions at a meal,

different from K 253 and Ω 49 (*Μοῖραι*), and δεξιτερός, in *Od.* only -ρή (*χείρ*), not of other parts of the body as in K 373, E 393, Δ 377, Π 405.

#### IV. Combinations of Words.

ἀριστῆς Παναχαιῶν, ὅμβρος ἀθέσφατος, πτολέμοιο στόμα, ἔχε τρόμος, ἔντεα καλά, ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἰνῶς, γήραϊ λυγρῷ, φαιδμα γυῖα, ἄργαλέος χόλος, ἄλκιμος νιός, ἀλλ' εἴ τις καλέσειε, Δὺ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος, στεροπὴ πατρὸς Διός, αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' ἥρως, πάντη ἐποιχόμενος, ἀμήχανός ἐστι, παῖδες ἀμύμονες, νὶξ ἐκάλυψε, θεράποντες Ἀρηος, θαλερῶν αἰξηῶν, δεύτερος αὗτε (αὖ) commencing a verse, κῦδος ἀρέσθαι (*Od.* once), γούνατ' ἐνώμα, χλωρὸς ὑπαὶ δείους, θυμὸς ἀνήκε, παρὲκ νόον, νόσφιν ἀπό, ἀγέρωχοι, of a people (*Od.*, only λ 286, of a person), κατ' αἴσαν, εὖ κατὰ κόσμον, ποικίλα τεύχεα, and ὑπὸ Τρώων ὁρυμαγδοῦ. With πόσις Ἡρῆς ἡνόμοιο cf. Ἐλένης πόσ. ἡνκ., with ὑψόθ' ἔοντι of Zeus, ὑψίγυγος, and with μελιηδέα πυρόν, μελίφρονα πυρόν. The formulae ὡς ἔφατ' ἔδεισεν δέ, οὐδ' ἀλαοσκοπιῆν εἶχε and πολὺς δ' ὁρυμαγδός belong to the *Il.* The two latter are found, outside it, only in the Lay in θ and the "Continuation" of the *Od.*

#### V. Constructions.

For these see Dr. Leaf's notes on K 39 (and A 26, μὴ οὐ), on 40 (infin. after ὑπόσχηται), on 111 (εἴ τις καλέσειεν), on 195 (κεκλήσατο βουλήν), on 349 (φωνήσαντε), on 416 (φυλακὰς δ' ἃς εἴρεα). On uses of prepositions in consonance with the practice of the *Il.* see p. 75 *supra*.

## APPENDIX J

### LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES IN A

#### I. ἄπαξ λεγόμενα.

στέμμα, λοιμός, θεοπρόπιον (?), Ἐκατηβελέτης, Σμυνθεύς, ἀνάποινος, ἀγέραστος, τὸ κρήγυον, τριπλός, τετραπλός, βωτιάνειρα, μεταξύ, ὑποβλήδην, δασμός, ὑπεροπλίη, ἡδυεπής, ἀμφηρεφής, οἰνοβαρίς (οἶνοβαρείων and οἴνψ βεβαρηότες in the *Od.*), φιλοκτέανος, δημοβόρος, παλίλλογος, ἔκατόγχειρος, παλινάγρετος, ἐπάίτιος, τομή, λέπω, φλοιός, κολωός, ἵστοδόκη, χερνίττομαι, ἔχθοδοπέω, λαμπετάω (if δ 662 be adjudged spurious), ἀπολυμαίνομαι, ἐπευφημέω, καταπέσσω, ἀποδέχομαι, προβούλομαι, ἐπαγείρω, μεταφράζομαι, ἀναθηλέω and μεθομιλέω.

#### II. Forms.

ἐλώρια, στάτερος, ἐλικώπιδα (elsewhere always masc.), προβέβουλα (H.G. 23), κυνῶπα, ἀφύξω (fut. of ἀφύσσω; if from a different verb, ἀ. λ.), σῆς and the like (Leaf on 179), ὅτον (if, as some think, an adv. in 187), ἀποαιρεῖνθαι, ἀποαίρεο, δολομῆτα, σφωτέρον, οὐτιδανός (plur.), μαχέοιτο and μαχέοιντο, perhaps θέλω, 277 and 554 (?), μέλω and κατανεύω in the mid., and χράυσμῃ. Iterative verbs are found in 490-2, ἐσ is certain in 3 places, and ἀν and ἦν occur 9 times. For many other so-called "Ionisms," καρτερός, Βριάρεως, βουλέων, etc., see Robert, 213 ff.

#### III. Meanings and Uses.

παρέρχομαι (*decipio*), ἀνάστω (of a god's protection of a locality,—Leaf on 38), διύφιλος (of a god), Ὀλύμπιοι (and Y 47, in a "late" passage), διύστημι (in figurative sense), κλάξω (of inanimate object), ἀφύσσειν (in unique figurative sense), στέλλομαι ("furl (sails),"—elsewhere στέλλω), παιήων ("hymn of praise"; in X 391, "chant of victory"), μέλπω (act., *carmine celebro*), τέκμωρ ("pledge"), παράφημι (act., "advise"), καθάπτομαι ("address," without unpleasant implication). See also the Commentaries on ὡς, 182, ὁππότε, 399, and ἥγομεν, 367.

#### IV. Combinations of Words.

*κλέπτε νόω, αἰχμητάων* with *Τρώων*, ὀνειδίζειν ἐπεστιν, ὀνείδεα μυθέομαι (and Υ 246, in the “late” *Aeneid*), ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν (after a patronymic; elsewhere (50 times) before the hero’s name in the second half of the verse), ἄγλας ἀποινα, ἡχήεσσα θάλασσα, στήθεα λάσια, πᾶν ἔργον = πάντα, ὀλοցῆι φρεσί, κυδιάνειρα with ἀγορῆ, λοιγύα ἔργα, γλυκὺν νέκταρ, and ἀπτονος χεῖρας (elsewhere χεῖρας -ες ἀπτονος -τοι, ending the verse).

#### V. Constructions.

ἀντιάω with accus., 31, a peculiar use of the pass. in *αὐτοῦ κινηθέντος*, 47, an unusual construction after *ἔξεπράθομεν*, 125, peculiar uses of *αὐτός* (Leaf on 47, 218, 500), unusual moods with *ἄν* and *μή* (Leaf on 232, 555), a rare use of *καὶ* in 249, the conjunction of subst. and adv., “perhaps unique” (Leaf), in 416, the “strange” accus. with *ἀνεδύστετο*, 496, the omission of *ἢ* in 547, the abnormal constrn. with *χραίσμωσιν*, 566, a peculiar use of *οὐ* in 603, and the rare *μὴ οὐ* in 28. For peculiar uses of prepositions see the Commentaries and the *H.G.* on *ἀνά*, 15, *διά*, 72, *πρός*, 239, 339, *κατά*, 271, 424, and *περί*, 317. For late uses of the Article, see pp. 85 f. *supra*.

#### VI. Other.

For the Digamma-phenomena see pp. 104 f. *supra*, and for some eccentricities of diction, Berger, *De Il. et Od. part. recent.* 70 ff. For peculiarities of versification see Hoermann, *Untersuchgn. üb. d. hom. Frage*, i. 41 f., and Dr. Leaf’s and other commentators’ notes on lines 15, 18 (the famous case of *θεοί*, which editors have laboured hard to remove), 39, 45, 53, 88, 170, 203, 205, 277, 344, 388, 489, 505, 533. On *τὰ φράγεα*, 554, Dr. Leaf has no note. But see Hartel, *Hom. Stud.* i.<sup>2</sup> 88, and *Jb.* 1884, 336. The only other case is K 11, of course a suspicious parallel. And there are what “may be,” as in K, false archaisms, though the critics, *ἐνθημοῦντες* in the presence of the *Mēnis*, do not so call them. *προθέοντι*, 291, is perhaps of this nature. *ἔρειομεν*, 62, and *βούλεται*, 67, are anomalies on a par with *ἐπείγετον* in K. See the Commentaries and Paech, *De vet. conjunct. Graec. form.* 23 and 34 f. On *ἀπηρών*, 430, see Cauer, preface to his *Odyssey*, xii., and *Grdfrgn.* 155, 492. For the “archaeological tendency” in A, see pp. 197 f. *supra*.

## APPENDIX K

### ODYSSEAN DICTION IN A

THE words and expressions in A found only in the *Od.* or the Odyssean books of the *Il.* are ἀτιμάλω, ἄφενος, ὕβρις, κώπη, ἀταρτηρός, δικασπόλος, οἴκαδ' ἵκέσθαι, πόλις Τροΐη = "Troy town," 129, which seems the best sense, as in λ 510, ἄμμε, 59, if used of more than two persons, as van Lœeuwen (*Mnemos.* xiii. 401) believes it is only here and in some places in the *Od.*, ἀμφιβέβηκα ("have under protection"), ἀνάστω with gen. of name of place (and once in Z), ἐρέφω (*ὅροφος, ὄροφή* only in Ω and the *Od.*), χωόμενος κῆρ, οὐρέυς, ἐποίχομαι (*invado, adorior*),—also in the Cyprian episode in E), ὅναρ, εὐχωλή (*precatio, votum*), μά, ἐπιτηδές, μάντις ἀμύμων (and once in T), ἀπριάτην, οἴκοι, οὐ δέμας οὐδὲ φυήν, ἐπιμέμφομαι (and B 225), ξυνήνα, ἐρέτης, ἐρέται ἑείκοσι, ἀναιδείη, ἀναιδείην ἐπιειμένος, ἡχήεις, αὐτῆμαρ, ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε, μογέω (and in a suspected couplet, 636 f., in Λ), τράφεν ἥδ' ἐγένοντο, ἀθερίζω, ὁρεσκώσ, ἀπήνης γαῖης, θεοὶ αἰὲν ἐόντες (and Φ 518, in the *Theomachy* or its junction with something more ancient), ὑπείξομαι, ἐρώέω (*fluo* or *ruo*), προερύειν (*νῆα*), ἀπέιρονα πόντον, περίσχεο, ἀδάκρυτος, ὠκύμορος ("doomed to early death"), ἐνζωνος (and in Z), ἴερὴ ἑκατόμβη, πολυνιενθής, πρότονοι, ὅρμος ("anchorage"), προερέστω, πρυμνήσια, ἐρετμόν, πεμπώβιολον, σπλάγχνα (and B 426), μολπή (and N 637, a suspected line), ἀνάγεσθαι, ἵκμενος οὖρος, στεῦρα, ἡπειρος, δεύτερον αὗτις, ἀποστείχω, ἐπιρρώμαι, συμφράζομαι, δολόμητις, ἐπιέλπομαι, εἰδήσειν, οὐδέ σε λήθω with variations of pron. and verb, κλυτοτέχνης, ἐπέηρα, δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον (and once in Z), γέλως ἀσβεστος, διὰ δόματα, φόρμιγξ, κακκείοντες, καθεύδω. With ἐλικώπιδα κούρην cf. the verse endings in Ω 26, B 433, and ζ 113, 142. ἄφαρ only A 349, a 410 and K 537.

It will be found that the formulae in 57, 233, 312, 445, 470, 475-6, 485 and 606 are confined to the *Od.* and the Odyssean books of the *Il.* ἐνθ' ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες, 22, with variations of case and number, is of frequent occurrence in the same area, and occurs outside it only in M. For τόδε μοι κρήγην ἔέλδωρ, 41, 504, cf. ρ 242. ἔξετ' ἐπειτ', 48, commencing a verse, recurs 4 times in the *Od.*. Line 76 is similarly found, with slight variations, 4 times in the *Od.*, and once in Z, and 286 only in K, Ψ, Ω and the *Od.*, and once in Θ. Line 601 occurs 6

times in the *Od.*, the latter part of it also in Ω 713 and τ 162. The formulae are certainly a strong bond between the *Mēnis* and the *Od.*

Parallel passages,—A 2, ρ 287, 474; A 5, λ 297; A 29, Ψ 553; A 59 f., ν 5 f.; A 78 f., K 32; A 88 f., π 438 f.; A 103 f., δ 661 f.; A 116, ε 219; A 141 f., π 348 f.; A 245, β 80; A 262, K 550; A 303, π 441; A 365, K 250 and Ψ 787; A 432, π 324; A 435 ff., ο 497 ff.; A 460 ff., γ 457 ff.; A 462 f., γ 459 f.; A 481 ff., β 427 ff.; A 493, Ω 31; A 575 f., σ 403 f.; A 599, θ 326; A 610, τ 49. See on this point Haupt in *Zusätze* to Lachmann's *Betrachtgn.*<sup>3</sup> 99, and E. H. Meyer, *Achilleis*, 254.

## APPENDIX L

### DID ODYSSEUS AND DIOMEDE RIDE OR DRIVE?

THE narrative is as follows, 470 ff. Rhēsus lies surrounded by his ἄριστῆς, all being asleep, and his horses stand near him, tethered to the framework of his car ἴμᾶσι. Odysseus and Diomedes approach. Odysseus points out the king to Diomedes, and bids the latter either loose the horses or slay the sleepers. Diomedes slaughters. As he kills, Odysseus drags the corpses aside to make a clear way for the horses. In due course Diomedes despatches Rhēsus himself last of all the company. Meantime Odysseus has untethered the horses, σὺν δ' ἡειρεν ἴμᾶσι, and led them clear of the throng, hitting them with his bow, as he had not thought of taking the whip out of Rhēsus' car. Then he signals to Diomedes, who is now considering whether he should make off with the car or butcher more Thracians. Athéné warns him of his risk if he tarries. He accepts the warning, and καρπαλίμως ὥππων ἐπεβήσετο. Odysseus smites the horses with his bow, and they speed towards the ships. At the spot where Dolon had been killed, Odysseus reins in (*ερυξε*), Diomedes jumps down, gives the spoils into Odysseus' hands, remounts, whips up the horses, and they gallop on,

At the fosse Nestor is the first to hear them. He also welcomes the heroes, who on their arrival κατέβησαν ἐπὶ χθόνα. He admires the horses, which are eventually tied up φάτνῃ ἐφ' ὥππειν with Diomedes' other steeds, but there is no separate reference either to the car or to Rhēsus' splendid suit of mail.

The discussion on these facts is ἀμφήρωτον. I have examined the views of 29 authorities, of whom 18 are for riding and 11 for driving. There are difficulties either way. I long held for riding, but careful consideration of the arguments of those who are against it has convinced me that they are right. Dr. Leaf formerly (on K 513 in his first edition) held that there was no need to assume that the heroes rode. Now he thinks they did, and that this is a "mark of lateness." I have already argued (p. 180 *supra*) that no such inference can be drawn.

The discussion is mainly concerned with three expressions,—σὺν δ' ἡειρεν ἴμᾶσιν, 499, and ἔρυξε . . . ὠκέας ὥππονς, 527, both of

Odysseus, and καρπαλίμως δ' ἵππων ἐπεβήσετο, 513, of Diomede. As to the first, we have seen (p. 237 *supra*) that the authorities regard συναείρω as = "harness." The alternative is Dr. Monro's (on 499) "he coupled them, harnessed them together," but it is not very clear how he conceives the operation. He adds, "he must at the same time have bridled them (perhaps this is implied by the word συναείρω) and mounted one: cp. 11, 514, 527." But bridling the horses for riding was surely impossible. There would be no *riding* bits and reins lying about. He and others seem to gather that Odysseus somehow coupled the horses and drove them out of the shambles, mounting one of them either before he began to make them move or after he got them clear, and that all that happened afterwards was that Diomede mounted the other and that both set off at a gallop. But this only makes the case worse. The two horses are supposed to gallop along (with riders on their bare backs who are carrying arms and, later, the spoils of Dolon), and tied by their heads or necks,—for surely no other way of "coupling" them was possible.<sup>1</sup> It is unheard of, especially in the dark. We cannot assume that the steeds were accustomed to being ridden at all, but we may assume that they had never been ridden in a way so calculated to bring disaster. They would soon have made their objections to such procedure felt, and Odysseus at any rate,—*ηησιώτης* and *ἄντππος*, as the scholiasts remind us,—would have been sorely put to it to keep his seat. δεινὸν τὸ ἡρωϊκόν, of course, and we can accept the scholiast's opinion that Odysseus τῇ πείρᾳ οὐ δευτερεύει τίνος, but we cannot think that the poet would have deliberately ascribed such a feat to him, or to Diomede either. Such things are done by heroes in a Persian or an Irish epic, not in Homer. The only way out of this difficulty is to assume that, before the heroes started, one of them uncoupled the horses, and that the poet takes this κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον. But even so, and if we waive the difficulty about riding reins and bits, there is the further one that in line 527 it is said that Odysseus at the spot where they had slain Dolon, ἔρυξε . . . ὠκέας ἵππους. Such action could not possibly be ascribed to him, if the poet had conceived him as riding one horse and Diomede the other, and the two horses as having been uncoupled.

Before we pass on to the second point, the peculiar view of Nitzsch—on ε 371—may just be mentioned. He seems to think (cf. schol. P.Q.T. on that line) that Diomede, when he gave up the idea of further slaughter, mounted one of the two horses, and that Odysseus followed, urging them on. In that case Odysseus must have run, and we know that he was a good runner. But the statement, referred to above, of what happened when he and Diomede arrived at the place of Dolon's death, is fatal here too. For it is said that

<sup>1</sup> Schol. to K 499: διὰ τὴν περίστασιν καθίζουσιν οἱ ἥρωες, συναρτήσαντες αὐτοὺς ἀναγκασθέντες ἐπὶ τοῖς γυμνοῖς τοῖς ἵπποις.

Diomede dismounted and gave the spoils of Dolon into the hands of Odysseus, remounted and whipped up the horses.

So far, then, the probabilities seem to be against riding. The next point is as to the exact meaning of *ἴππων ἐπεβήσετο*, used in 513 of Diomede after he gives up the idea of doing more killing, and joins Odysseus, who has signalled to him and is standing waiting for him beside the horses. The advocates of driving point out that *ἴπποι* is regularly used of a car, or of a whole equipage, that is, car and horses together, and that the phrase we are considering means in other passages simply "mounted the car." That is a consideration of some weight, certainly. But the phrase is of the nature of a formula, and might be transferred, *more Homeric*, to an operation not quite identical with the one to which it is generally applied. It is more relevant to point out that Diomede could mount only the one horse, and that, whether Odysseus is conceived as already seated on one of the horses or not, the plural *ἴπποι* would not be appropriate of Diomede's jumping on to the back of the other. The application of the formula could hardly be stretched so far.

But those who are for riding also urge that it cannot be a case of driving, because Odysseus had brought out only the horses, and it is not stated that Diomede brought out the car. When Odysseus signalled to his friend, the latter was standing pondering two courses,—not three, as some say; two of their three are only different forms of the first alternative,—whether to make off with the car (dragging it by the pole or lifting it up bodily) or to kill some more Thracians. When Athéné warns him not to waste more time, he obeys and "mounts." But what does he mount? It is not stated that he takes the car, and we should expect to be told so, if he did. It is, however, replied with some force that Homeric practice justifies us in inferring that he did. In the first place, when a personage in the poems is represented as pondering over two courses, he generally ends by doing the one thing or the other. See Sickel, *Q.H.* i. 12, referring to A 189, II 647 and E 671. In the last Odysseus is halting in much the same state of doubt as Diomede is in in K. And, in the second place, it may be urged that Athéné's admonition refers only to the contemplated slaughter. *That* would take time; the removal of the car would not. The poet seems to intend to convey that, when Diomede followed Athéné's advice, he gave up the idea of staying to kill, the only course fraught with danger, and adopted the other.

Yet another argument in favour of riding is advanced with some confidence by Mr. Lawson, *a.l.* "If," he says, "as we hear in ll. 500-1, Odysseus was reduced to using his bow to lash the horses,"—that is, when he was bringing them through the corpses to clear ground,—"because he had forgotten to take the whip out of the chariot," why did he continue to use his bow (ll. 513-14) after the

horses had been harnessed to the chariot in which he knew he had previously left the whip?" I think we must infer from the wording of 500 f. that the poet means that there *was* a whip in the car. But even so, it seems a sufficient answer to say that Odysseus, a *νησιώτης* unused to charioteering, might still omit to avail himself of the whip. It is not said that Odysseus notices he had forgotten to take it. The poet only observes that it did not occur to him to take it. And, *per contra*, we may point to *μάστιξεν δ' ἵπποις*, 530, said of Diomede, when he remounts after securing the spoils of Dolon. He gives the spoils to Odysseus and evidently takes control himself. If he did not whip up the horses with Rhēsus' *μάστιξ*, what *did* he use? And if he used the *μάστιξ*, he must have been in the car.

The opponents of driving urge finally that at the close of the incident there is a good deal which, on the theory of driving, must be assumed to be conveyed *κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον*. On the arrival of the heroes at the fosse, Nestor expresses the greatest admiration for the horses, but not a word is said about the car,—the armour, which was in the car, he might not see,—though it was, we are told in 438, of splendid workmanship. As to that, however, it may be said that *ἵπποι* used by Nestor in 545 and 550, and by Odysseus in his reply, 557 and 559, may possibly be meant as usual to include the car. Again, it is objected that the disposal of the car and of Rhēsus' armour is not mentioned in the finale, though we are told, 567 ff., what is done with the horses. But when a poet is hastening to wind up his story, and has given all the essentials that early readers or hearers would expect, we should beware how we insist that not one detail shall be omitted. See p. 227 *supra*. The recourse to *σιωπήσις* as an explanation of difficulties is no doubt overdone by some critics, but that the expedient, if such it can be called, is common in the poems admits of no doubt whatever. Schömann's *De Reticentia Homeri* may be referred to, and cf. Bonitz, *Ursprung*, 78 f. It is, as Eustathius puts it, a convenient *μέθοδος συντομίας, ὡς μὴ θέλοντος τοῦ πουητοῦ ἐνδιατρίβειν τοὺς μὴ καιρίους*,—a way the poet or poets has or have in telling his or their stories. Objection is not made to the statement in B that Agamemnon sat down after making his speech, although in line 55 it had not been stated that he stood up to speak.

On the whole the probabilities seem to be decidedly in favour of driving. The amount of the *σιωπήσις* is a difficulty, but not unmitigated. The objections to a ride of the kind suggested, especially in the dark, are not so easy to get over or to palliate. We must assume *σιωπήσις* here too,—in regard to both the uncoupling of the horses before the ride began and the fact that Odysseus had mounted one of them.

Since writing the above, I have procured a copy of an article, "Equestrianism in the Doloneia," by Professor Perrin, published in

*Transns. of the American Philolog. Assocn.* vol. xvi. 1885. It is an extremely full and able statement of the case for riding. But it fails to persuade me. To rebut the arguments used would take me over much of the ground already covered above. I confine myself therefore to brief remarks on three points.

1. By *ἴππων ἐπεβήσετο* Professor Perrin understands that Diomede mounts one of the horses. First, it is urged that that is not strange when the two horses are coupled together. But I cannot accept that fact as reducing the incongruity of the phrase in its application to mounting one horse. Secondly, "to describe a man's mounting one of the horses thus fastened together, the New-Englander can certainly say 'he mounted the team,' even though the word 'team' often includes vehicle." That is natural enough in a country where a driver regularly mounts one horse of two attached to a vehicle, to drive the whole. But in Homer a car is never driven in that way, and consequently the transfer to the horses standing without a vehicle behind them of a phrase descriptive of what is not a usual everyday occurrence, seems unnatural and unlikely.

2. "Odysseus unites the horses from the chariot box" (*ἐπιδιφριάς*), "couples them together with their halter straps and starts to drive them with *extemporised reins* and goad down through the ranks of sleeping Thracians." The words I have italicised assume a good deal. And granting that there were *ἱπάντες* other than those mentioned by the poet, what about bits? How could there be riding without them? And does the assumption not involve a considerable addition to the *σιώπησις* already involved in the view that there was riding?

3. In regard to the two courses which Diomede pondered, Professor Perrin says "either exploit would be rash, for it would take time." This is surely not a correct statement. To move off *with* the car would take little more time than to move off *without* it. To slay "more Thracians" would involve considerable delay, and in addition the risk of an alarm being raised by a cry from one of the victims.

I note in conclusion that the paper is not free from prejudice against the Doloneia. Thus in one place Dūntzer is followed in his statement that the lay "abounds in abrupt transitions and incomplete descriptions, at great variance with the usual epic minuteness." As to transitions, they seem to me to be regulated by epic rule most scrupulously (p. 174 *supra*). Of incomplete descriptions I find no trace either in the lay itself or in the comments of its critics. Its author is usually blamed for excessive minuteness.

## APPENDIX M

αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σιδηρος, π 294 = τ 13

THIS old crux has been discussed recently by Professor Burrows in his *Discoveries in Crete*, 214 ff. He refers to Professor Ridgeway's *E.A.G.* i. 294 and 303 ff., and to Mr. Lang's *H. and A.* 176-208. See also his review of the latter in *C.R.* xxi. 19 ff., and Mr. Lang's reply, *ibid.* 49 ff. *σιδηρος* is taken as meaning weapons of steel for cutting or thrusting, that is, swords and spears. But throughout the poems, except in this single sentence, such weapons are described as made of bronze. We find a club and an arrowhead of iron or steel, but no swords or spears. The word *σιδηρος*, therefore, in the two lines quoted above, is in conflict with every other mention of swords and spears in the poems.

What is to be done with this repeated line? Professor Burrows can accept it as not inconsistent with his "evolution theory" of the origin of the poems; it clearly belongs to a late stage in their development, when iron had superseded bronze as the chief metal for weapons. Others regard it as an interpolation made in that late period. Much controversy has taken place on the two passages of the *Od.* in which it occurs, and no commentator on that poem can avoid dealing with the matter. Reference may be made to the treatises of Kirchhoff, Kammer, Blass, Monro, Hayman, Ameis-Hentze and many others.

Only one attempt, so far as we are aware, has been made to amend the line. The Leyden editors accept ἐφέλκεται ἀνέρα χαλκός, which Mr. Agar (*Homeric*, 279) approves. In the age of iron the change to *σιδηρος* "would follow inevitably in a proverbial saying."

We suggest that the original may have been αὐτὸς γὰρ ὄφελλεται ἄνδραί δῆρις (not ἐφέλκεται as given by Mr. Lang in *Anthropol. and Class.* 65), "for just in such wise" or "readily doth strife spread among men." This appears to suit the context and to be Homeric in wording, construction and style. Can we then explain the corruption?

αὐτὸς from αὐτῶς requires no remark. The interchange of these words has occurred in other passages. Corruption may have set in

at the end of the line. A rare word sometimes caused difficulty.  $\delta\hat{\eta}\rho\iota s$  is such a word. It occurs in the poems only P 158 and ω 515. The only derivatives are  $\delta\eta\rho\acute{a}omai$  or  $\delta\eta\rho\acute{o}mai$ , five times in the *Il.* and twice in θ 76-8, and  $\delta\hat{\eta}\rho\acute{t}os$ , P 42. Both noun and verb appear to be old poetical words.  $\delta\hat{\eta}\rho\iota s$  is not the final word in either of the two lines in which it occurs;  $\sigma\acute{d}\eta\rho\acute{o}s$ , on the other hand, is found, in its various cases, in 31 places other than the two under reference, and in 30 of these it closes the verse, as in our two lines. A scribe familiar with it in that position might easily, and by a mistake of only one letter, produce  $\sigma\acute{d}\eta\rho\acute{o}s$  from ΑΝΔΡΑΣΙΔΗΡΙΣ. If  $\alpha\acute{n}t\acute{o}s$  had already been copied down, that would help. The mistake once made,  $\delta\acute{f}\acute{e}\lambda\lambda\acute{e}ta\iota$  could not stand, and  $\acute{e}\phi\acute{f}\acute{e}\lambda\kappa\acute{e}ta\iota$  may have been substituted. The use of the latter verb in the mid. was common in post-Homeric Greek, in the same sense as it bears in our passage. The mid. is not found elsewhere in Homer. The passive occurs N 597 and Ψ 696. Or  $\delta\acute{f}\acute{e}\lambda\lambda\acute{e}ta\iota$  itself may have been the original stumbling-block. It is an old epic verb,—L. and S. and Veitch, *s.v.*,—and may not have been familiar. The phrase  $\delta\hat{\eta}\rho\iota s \delta\acute{f}\acute{e}\lambda\lambda\acute{e}i\iota$  does not occur in Homer. But in Hesiod, *Opp.* 14 and 33, it is used in close connection with  $\acute{e}\rho\iota s$ , as in the two lines in the *Od.* In Homer we have  $\delta\acute{f}\acute{e}\lambda\lambda\acute{e}i\iota \sigma\acute{t}\acute{o}nōv$  (of  $\acute{e}\rho\iota s$ ), Δ 445, and  $\delta\acute{f}\acute{e}\lambda\lambda\acute{e}i\iota \pi\acute{o}nōv$ , B 420, Π 651 and β 334, both of which are very similar to the suggested combination with  $\delta\hat{\eta}\rho\iota s$ . In the passive  $\delta\acute{f}\acute{e}\lambda\lambda\acute{w}$  occurs Ψ 524 and ξ 233.

It is also worth noticing that  $\alpha\acute{n}t\acute{o}s \sigma\acute{d}\eta\rho\acute{o}s$  is in a manner unique in the poems. Applied adjectively to names of gods, human beings or animals,  $\alpha\acute{n}t\acute{o}s$  is very frequent in the poems. Applied to nouns denoting inanimate objects, it occurs 33 times, but always in an oblique case, sing. or plur., except in the repeated line in the *Odyssey*. Homeric usage is thus slightly against the probability of either  $\alpha\acute{n}t\acute{o}s \sigma\acute{d}\eta\rho\acute{o}s$  or  $\alpha\acute{n}t\acute{o}s \chi\acute{a}lkōs$  being the original reading.

# INDEX

## 1. GENERAL

- Abstract nouns in *Od.*, 47 ; prepositional uses, 72, 73 f.
- Abusive language, 166, 209
- Achaeans, plight of, 5, 8 ; poet's sympathy, 7 ff., 128, 148, 183 ; heroes' ways, 6 ff., 155, 173, 175 ; attitude of *Il.* to, 171 n.
- Achilleid, of Wecklein and others, 32, 212 ; of Geddes, 164 ff., 176
- Achilles, quarrel and secession, 1, 152, 157, 211 ; saga figure, 32, 162 ; not a satisfactory hero, 33 ; sole hope of the Achaeans, 145 f., 148, 157 ; prayer for Patroclus, 202 ; curse on Agamemnon, 154 ; and 123, 124, 152, 164, 166, 182, 189, 210
- Action, laws regulating, 174
- Adverbs in the *Il.*, 44
- Aeneas, xi, 179, 248
- Aeolic, Fick's views of, 224
- Aesthetic judgments, 30 f.
- Aethiopians, 206
- Agamemnon, Thessalian, xi ; despair and distress, 1 ff., 153 f., 157, 184, 200, 222 ; in the *Epipolēsis*, 123, 155 ; in A, 143 ; in K, 151 ff., 173 ; he and Nestor, 145, 157 ff. ; brutality, 155, 207, 210 ; stature, 164 ; in his hut, 181, 200 ; in A, 210 f.
- Age of the Doloneia, 14 ff., 51, 109, 114 ff., 138, 198, 203. And *passim*
- Agriculture, 42 and *n.*
- Aias, premier hero, xi f., 33 ; made into two, 150 ; loyalty of, 153 ; not compared to an ass, 165 ; language used of, 172 ; shield, 189, 196 ; prayer, 202
- Ailments, vocabulary of, 43
- Alexandrian critics, 22 f., 77, 138, 172, 265, and App. A *passim*
- Amynor, 187 and *n.*
- Anatomy, vocabulary of, 43
- Andromaché, 154, 159, 249
- Apaté, Odyssean, 206
- Aphrodité, epithets of, 246
- Apollo, in K, 159, 258 ; in A, 169, 207 ff., 211 ; epithets, 246 ; and 123, 124
- Appellatives, the Greek, 54
- Archaeology, assistance to Homeric enquiry, xii ff., 186
- Archaic language, 40 f., 246 ff.
- Archaising, xv, Chap. XI., 192, 197 f., 211 f., 216, 219, 271
- Archery. See Bow
- Architecture, 42 *n.*
- Areithoüs, 189
- Ares, epithets of, 246
- Aristophanes, quoted, 73
- Aristotle, quoted or referred to, 37, 121, 142, 171, 174, 178, 179, 210, 223
- Armour and dress, of Odysseus and Diomede, 2, 5, 6, 55 ; in K, 4, 197 f., 200 ; in *Il.* and *Od.*, 42 ; epithets, 49 ; and 64, 175, 190, 251, and Chap. XXIII. And see Lion-skins, Shield, Spear, Corslet, Helmet, Greaves, Casque
- Arsis and Thesis, 99 *n.*
- Artemis, 169, 250
- Article, Chap. X. ; views, 77 f., 87 ; interpretations, 78 ; Attic, 78, etc. ; in *Il.* and *Od.*, 79, 81, 239 ; due to corruption, 79 ; classification of uses, 79 ; of contrast, 79, 85 f. ; in Odyssean books, 79 f., 87 ; in K, 80 ff., 235 ; in A, 85 f. ; in Continuation of *Od.*, 86 ; in Telemachy, 86 f. ; in Ω, 87 ; difference in occurrences, 87 f. ; in later poetry, 88 ; easily omitted, 54, 88 f.
- Artistic canons, 3
- Asia Minor, knowledge of, 206
- Asios, 158
- Assemblies, 83, 147 ff., 207, 209 f., 261
- Asyndeton, 54, 175, 208
- Até, 66, 206
- Athené, care for Odysseus and Diomede, 2 f., 172, 187, 202 ; her cunning, 7 ; λητός, ἀγελέτη, 61 ; in A, 144, 210 ; in K, 159 f. ; in Ur-Ilias, 211
- Athenians, influence on poems, 160 f., 211 ; not in K, 176

Attack on language of K, Chap. V.  
Autolycus, 64, 168, 201

Bards, 7, 21, 227, 249  
Baths, 181 f.  
Bavarian epic referred to, 186  
Bearbeiter, 19, 21, 216  
Beggars, 249  
Beowulf, 89, 142, 189  
Biblical Criticism, 18 n., 55  
Booty, distribution of, 211  
Bow, 38, 144, 168 ff., 189, 209  
Briareus, 209, 211, 212  
Briseis, 154, 158  
Bronze and iron, 279  
Bucolic Diaeresis, 107, 109 ff., 235  
Burden of proof, in Homeric Question, xxi f.; in interpolations, 17  
Burglary in the poems, 64, 201  
Burlesque, in K, Chap. XXIV.; in A, 207  
Butchery and cruelty, 6 f., 12, 41, 155 f.  
  
Casque, 6, 55, 168, 190, 197, 201  
Catalogue of the ships, 12, 15, 100, 102, 146, 206  
Cento, K a, 115, 118, 124 f., 220  
Characters, Homeric faculty of drawing, and consistency of, 150 f.  
Chariot, 62, 180, 196, 276 ff.  
Chaucer referred to, 46, 141, 178  
Chios and Homer, 21, 22  
Chorizontic belief. See *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.  
Chronology in the epos, 183, 226  
Chrysé, Chryseis, Chryses, 207 f., 210, 212  
Civilisation, advance claimed in *Od.*, 42 f., 249 ff.  
Clearness, want of in K and A, 208  
Combinations of words, peculiar, 54; in K, 260; in K and *Od.*, 266; in K and *Il.*, 269; in A, 271; in A and *Od.*, 272  
Comedy in K, 12, Chap. XXIV.  
Commonplace, the epic, deviations from in K, 29, 96, 176, 219; varied, 54, 56 f.; in repetitions, Chap. XIV. *passim*  
Comparatives and superlatives in K, 58  
Compound words, 44, 58, 234  
Conclusion of K objected to, 227 f.  
Constructions, peculiar, in K, 59, 67, 69 ff., 126, 262, 267; in K and *Il.*, 269; in A, 271  
Continuation of the *Od.*, Cynaethus author, 22; free from linguistic vices, 48; Article in, 86; foreshadowed, 146; éš in, 255  
Contraction of vowels, 50, 67, 223, 224, 233, 235, 236  
Contrasts, 9, 207, 220  
Corslet, absence of, from K, and theories, 193 ff.

Country life, 5, 65, 175  
Crete, light from, xii ff., 65; Odysseus' connection with, 168 ff.; corslet and shield in script, 195, 197  
Critics and their methods, ix, xix, 216 ff.; not free from bias, 3, 215; bowdlerisation, 7; application of modern standards, 13, 23, 179, 183, 215; ways with interpolations, Chap. III.; appeals for precedents, 29; possibility and certainty, 33; arbitrariness, 49, 100, 222; Article, 79; *Unebenheiten*, 171; doubtful procedure, 190 f., 254; their principles applied to A, Chap. XXV.; critics hard to please, 227; imitation or reminiscence alleged, 240, 248  
Culture in the poems, xv  
Cunning, 7, 162  
Cursing-man, professional, in A, 212  
Cyclics, xvii; versification, 107; degeneration in, 151, 176; Cypria, 15, 208  
Cyclops, 55, 250  
Cynaethus, 22, 217  
Cypria. See Cyclics  
  
Datives, 52, 236, 256  
Deictic ó and óvros, 83, 84  
Demodocus' Lay in θ, 8, 206, 239 f., 246  
Derivatives, 57  
Descriptions in detail, 190, 278  
Dieuchidas, 134 f., 136  
Difficulties, 2 n., 18, Chap. XXII.  
Diffuseness in K, 12, 208, 216  
Digamma, xx, Chap. XII.; corruption from ignorance of, 26; in Continuation of *Od.*, 48; neglect of, in formulae, 50; use by Dissectors, 97 f., 220; phenomena uniform, 98, 105; digammated words, differences as to, 99; neglects, what? 99 f.; semi-vowel, 100; in Hesiod and Archilochus, 101; Hoffmann, 101 f.; Thumb, 102 f.; effects, 102; in P, N, Ω, 103; in K, 103 f., 222; in A, 104 f.; in Bucolic Diaeresis, 111; metric bound up with, 114  
Dignity, epic, alleged want of in K, 12, 199, 209  
Diogenes Laertius, 135, 136  
Diomedes, his pluck, 1, 2, 5; and Nestor, 1, 5, 116 f., 146, 147, 155, 200, 203; his bivouac, 4, 234, 181, 191, 197; Athene's care for, 5, 159; his corslet, 5; double origin of, 140, 150, 154; in I, 147 f.; in K, 154 ff.; and Agamemnon, 152, 155; his slaughter of the Thracians, 156; combinations of words used of, 174; as rider, 195; as hoplite, 197; and Dolon, 203. And see Odysseus.

- Direct speech in *Il.* and *Od.*, 39 f., 110, 131, 244; change to indirect, 226
- Disaffection in the camp, 2, 148, 152
- Distance, measures of, 175
- Dogs, 209, 210
- Dolon, his offer, start and reward, 2, 5, 8; accoutrements, 3, 56, 58, 227, 229 f.; capture and death, 6, 7, 63, 155 f., 162, 225 f.; character, 6 and n., 158 f.; essential to the story, 200; on a vase, 138; and 187, 199, 201
- Doloneia, its low place in critical estimation, viii; position in and connection with *Il.*, 8, 127 f., 143 ff., and Chap. XXI.; popular, 59 f.; foreshadowed in *O.*, 146; characters consist with rest of *Il.*, 151 ff.; compared with *Ur-Ilia*, Chap. XXV. and *passim*.
- Do ut des*, 5, 118
- Dramatic faculty, 174
- Dreams, 212, 226, 262
- Dress. See Armour and dress
- Dual verb forms, 51, 235
- Duality of characters, 150, 164
- Eastern peoples and ways, 154, 175, 192, 212, 249
- Egypt and the *Od.*, xiv
- Einleger*, Fick's, 14 f., 225, 227
- Einzellied*, K as an, 59 f., 133, 137, 139
- Elision, 52, 100, 110, 112 f.
- Emendations, Chap. IV. and App. C, 18, 23, 49, 59 f., 97, 99; now proposed, 24 and App. B, 67, 232, 234, 235
- Enclitics, position of, 69
- Epic, old English, 178
- Epics of other nations, xviii f. And see separate titles as *Sháhnáma*, *Kalewala*, *Beowulf*, etc.
- Epic technique, 174 f.
- Epipolésis*, the, 146, 152 f., 155, 160, 166
- Episodes, 142 f., 182 f.
- Epithets, interchanged, 25, 230, 236; in *Il.* and *Od.*, difference, 38, 39; archaic, 40, 257; of armour, 49; varied to suit metre, 54; single occurrences, 56 f., 168, 176 f., 260; not always appropriate, 119; of Athéné, 61; of war, 65; of Odysseus, 167; in K, 266
- Ethics of heroic age, 41, 155 f., 162, 250
- Eumeaus, 169, 191
- Euripides quoted or referred to, 7, 8, 10, 234
- Eustathius quoted or referred to, 22, 133, 138, 140, 255
- Evolution of epic, xix
- Ewes and lambs, offer of, 185 f., 197, 223
- Expansionist theory, xi, 33
- Expedition of Odysseus and Diomedes, 2 f., 5 ff., 8, 184
- Expurgation of the poems, 41, 150, 210, 216
- Feasts, 166, 175, 185
- Felt, 55
- Forms of words, varied to suit metre, 54, 58; strange, in K, 59, 66 ff., 259; Odyssean, in K, 126, 266; in K and the *Il.*, 268; in A, 270
- Formulae, difference of in *Il.* and *Od.*, 38 f.; abnormalities in, 50, 108; in repetitions, Chap. XIV. *passim*; used inappropriately, 202; Odyssean in A, 272 f.; in K and the *Il.*, 269; and 242 and 250
- Gender, neglected *metri gratia*, 54
- Genitives, 52, 54, 111, 224
- Geography, Homeric, rehabilitated by M. Bérard, xiv
- Gifts, Athéné's promise of, in A, 154
- Glaucus, 173, 202
- Gluttony of Odysseus, 186 f.
- Gnomic sayings, 41, 209, 220
- Goethe referred to, xxiii, 3 f., 18, 122, 178, 179, 183, 228
- Grammar, difference of in *Il.* and *Od.*, 36, 39, 43, App. D; effect on, of direct speech, 39, and of repetition, 40; variety of Homeric, 53; liberties with, 54
- Greaves, not in K, 193 f.
- Grief, manifestations of, 154
- Guards of the camp, 121, 148 f., 153, 221
- Hagia Triada vase, the, 195
- Hairdressing in *Il.* and *Od.*, 42
- Hebé, 207
- Hector, Boeotian, xi; offer to Dolon, 2, 186; sanguine spirit and disappointment, 5, 7, 8, 143, 184; irresistible by help of Zeus, 152, 153, 157; in K, 158, 173
- Helmet, 193 f., 198. And see Casque
- Hephaestus, 206, 207, 209, 211, 212
- Hera, 210, 246
- Hérakles, 176, 191, 192 f.
- Hermes, 64, 121, 159, 204
- Herodotus, his digressions, 142
- Heroes, Homeric, vicissitudes of, xi
- Heroic ideal, 151, 155 f.
- Hesiod, quoted or referred to, 26, 51, 52, 83, 217; language of, 52; Article in, 88; versification, 106, 109; and 176, 207, 209, 211, 241, 280
- Hiatus, emendation to cure, 26 and n., 70, 234, 235; in relation to *F*, 102; in K, 109; in Bucolic Diaeresis, 109 ff.;

- kinds, 110; after ε, 111 f.; left by elision, 112 f.; how far avoided, 113
- Hippokoön, 159, 258
- Hipponax, 15
- Hobbies, horses', 62
- Homer, use of name, xv, xxii, 30; to be interpreted from his works, 31 f.; medical knowledge of, 43. And *passim*
- Homeric, uses of the term, 30 f., 51; K not, 12, 199, 202 n.; procedure in A not, Chap. XXV. *passim*
- Homeric Age, reality of, xv; our ignorance of, 186
- Homeric language, xx, 41, 50, 94; in *Illiad* and *Odyssey*, respectively, 43 f.; only known from the poems, 46, 55; uniformity of, 48, 98; interpolators' knowledge of, 48; copiousness, variety and flexibility, 53, 73
- Homeric poems, love and reverence for, xvi, 21
- Homerids, xxii, 21, 171 f., 174
- Hoplopoenia, 21, 55
- Horace quoted or referred to, 163, 182, 202, 203, 204, 211, 213, 227
- Horses, and car of Achilles, 2, 7 f., 84, 123, 158, 175, 203; of Rhesus, 3, 62, 175, 179 f., 201, 227, App. L; Diomedes's association with, 140, 176; in K, 175; in Ψ, 176; epithets, 246
- Humour in K, 117, Chap. XXIV.
- Hymns, the Homeric, K same age as, 15; gens. and dats. in, 52; F in, 102, 103; versification, 107, 109; and 204, 207, 241. Hym. Ap., 22; Hym. Merc., 52, 112, 204, 245
- Hyperbole in A, 209
- Idomeneus, 153, 169, 223
- Illiad* and *Odyssey*, language of, one, Chap. VI., Apps. D and E, 53, 65, 129; Article in, 79; F, 98, 105; versification, 106 ff., 111; ἐστι, 255
- Imitation. See Plagiarism and Imitation.
- Inconsistencies. See *Unebenheiten*.
- Inorganic lines, 33, 181, 210, 212, 218
- Interpolation, xix, Chap. III.; in K 19 f., 22 f., App. A; principles of adjudication, 17 f.; Blass and Jebb, 19; Leaf on weathering, 20; interpolators, who? 20 ff.; their strange proceedings, 160 f.; freedom to manipulate the poems, 141 f., 217 f.; interpolator of A, 142; of K, 176; corslet interpolations, 193 f.
- Introductory part of K, unduly long, 4, 227
- Ionia and the poems, xvi
- Irish epic referred to, 189, 201, 243, 275
- Irony, tragic, in K, 8
- Iros, 182, 209
- Iterative verbs, 50, 52 f., 253 ff., 270
- Jod, 111
- Kalchas, 210
- Kingship in A, 210
- Kinship, vocabulary of, 43
- Lachmannism, xi
- Laertes' apparel, 191
- Lateness of passages, as basis of disruption, viii, xxii f.; proved by linguistic peculiarities, 49 ff.; by pseudo-archaisms, 90, 95 f.; by anything uncommon, 180; absence of indications in K, 176; linguistic usages that persisted into later Greek, 40 f.; absence in late books of late indications, 51, 65 f., 69, 81
- Later Greek, approximation to, in language of K, 50 f.
- Lied* and *Epos*, xviii
- Linguistic peculiarities, xx, Chap. VII.; those in K, Chap. VIII. and App. G; some really mistakes of copyists, 25; enumerations of, in K, 27 f. and n.; how to be estimated, 31 f., 34, 49, 59; Orszulik's plan criticised, 28 f.; caused by metrical necessity, 53; in *Ur-Ilias*, 59; in A, 205, App. J; and 216
- Lion-skins in K, 14, 176, 192 f., 209
- Logical interpretation of the epic, 3, 179, 220
- Longinus quoted or referred to, 37, 243 n.
- Mahābhārata* referred to, xviii, 203 n.
- Marriage bond, 210
- Meanings, words with a variety of, 53; strange, in K, 65 f., 258 f.; Odyssean, in K, 265; Iliadic, 268; peculiar to A, 270; Odyssean, 272
- Medical knowledge in the poems, 43 and n.
- Megeis, 223
- Melanthios, treatment of, 41, 156, 209, 250
- Menelaus, 121, 153, 158, 173, 200, 248
- Menestheus, 160
- Mēnis*. See *Ur-Ilias* or *Mēnis*
- Meriones, lends Odysseus a bow, 144, 168, 169; and 153, 185, 248
- Metrical convenience or necessity, 53 f., 57, 58, 64, 67, 73, 76, 83, 87, 106 ff., 168, 236
- Middle voice, 54, 58, 266
- Milton quoted or referred to, 31, 45, 46, 53, 55, 58, 87, 178, 223, 228, 258
- Minos, xiii
- Modernisation. See Text.
- Modesty, false, Achaean heroes not given to, 173
- Möglichkeit ist nicht Notwendigkeit*, 33
- Monotony of the *Illiad*, complaints of, 142 f.

- Mules, 209, 210, 222  
 Mycenae, seat of suzerainty, xiv.;  
   Mycenaean culture, Reichen and Robert  
   on, 194; shields, 197  
 Mythology and myths, fluidity of, 41
- Nansikaa and her brothers, 159  
 Necessities of the moment, 9, 156, 159,  
   200  
*Ne damnemus quod non intellegimus*,  
   187  
 Neleids and the poems, 22, 147  
 Nestor, his sons, 2 n., 153, 185, 187 f.;  
   friend of Agamemnon, 2, 145, 221,  
   222; in K, 4, 153, 156 ff., 173, 199;  
   in I, 147 ff.; his shield and his son's,  
   5, 144; interpolated by Neleids, 22;  
   military adviser, 163; his apparel,  
   191; has no corslet, 193; and 1, 121,  
   155, 167, 181, 182, 200, 201, 208,  
   221 f.
- Nibelungenlied* referred to, xviii, 189,  
   190, 195  
 Night in K, 13, 14, 140; effect on  
   language, 55, 131, 266; night as space  
   of darkness, 73, 74 f.; a crowded night,  
   182 f.; difference between night and  
   day work, 193 f.
- Nireus, 161  
 Nomenclature, 175  
 Nyktegersia, 1, 127 f., 190
- Odysseanism in the *Iliad*, Chap. XV.,  
   and Apps. D and E *passim*; and 14,  
   28, 37, 66, 69, Chap. IX., 75, 79 f., 80,  
   106, 111, 107 ff., 110 ff., 129, 168,  
   201 f., 205 ff., and App. K, 210, 215,  
   219, 224 f.
- Odysseus, Chap. XX.; his part in the  
   adventure, 2, 5; association with  
   Diomede, 7, 81, 145, 166, 172 f., 176,  
   202, 227; popular hero, 131; degraded  
   by the Cycles, 151; in the *Epipolēsis*,  
   155, 166; in Α, 165 f.; in Θ, 166 f.;  
   as bowman, 168 f.; phraseology used  
   of him alone, 172; his gluttony, 186 f.;  
   his equipment in K, 191 f.; as rider,  
   195 and App. L; and 38, 122, 191,  
   203, 206
- Olympia, 61, 193, 197  
 Olympus, 206, 207, 209, 211  
 Omen in K, 159, 187  
 Optative mood, 40, 43, 241 ff., 70, 226  
 Ossian, 95
- Pandarus, 180  
 Panthotis, sons of, 172  
 Papyri referred to, 56, 65
- Parallel passages, Chap. XIV., 15 f., 219  
   f., 273. And see Repetitions, and  
   Plagiarism and Imitation
- Parallel versions, amalgamation of, 211
- Paris, xi, 168, 191, 209, 249, 251  
 Patroclus, 155, 158, 187, 202  
 Penelopé, 119, 169, 250  
 Perfects, 54, 68, 92  
 Peripeteia in K, 8 and n., 203  
 Philoctetes, 161, 168  
 Phraseology, used of or by individuals,  
   172 ff., repeated unconsciously, 174
- Piers Plowman*, 141  
 Pindar, Article in, 88; scholia, 22, 138  
 Pisander of Kameiros, 192 f.
- Pisistratus and his *Ordner* or Com-  
   mission, xii, 21, 22, 49, 122, 127, 147,  
   149, 160, 216, and Chap. XVI.
- Plagiarism and imitation charged against  
   K, 12, 56, 90, 201 f., 204, 216, 219,  
   260, and Chap. XIV.
- Pleonasm, 221, 223, 261  
 Pope referred to, 18, 204  
 Position, neglect of, in verse, 106 f.  
 Position in verse, words recurring in  
   same, 26, 177  
 Praetorium in the camp, 181  
 Prayers of the heroes, 5, 118, 172, 175,  
   202, 229
- Prepositions, Chap. IX., 219, 271  
 Presbeia to Achilles, 1, 137, 148, 152,  
   182
- Priam, 124, 154, 158, 249  
 Proöm to *Iliad*, 179, 208  
 Protesilaus, 172  
 Prothystra, 54  
 Proverbs, Homeric, 204  
 Pseudo-Archaisms. See Archaising  
 Public of the early poet, 3, 4, 7 f., 9, 13,  
   183, 201, 227  
 Pylian Epos, supposed, 157, 208
- Quality of K as epic poetry, 9 f., 12 ff.  
 Quarrels, 33, 207, 208, 211  
 Quintilian referred to, 175, 202
- Razors, 64  
 Reaction against disintegrating criti-  
   cism, x  
 Relative, attraction of, 241  
 Religion. See Theology and Religion  
 Repetitions, xix; common phenomenon,  
   18, 201; effect of, on language of *Ili*.  
   and *Od.*, 40; in K and the *Od.*,  
   115 ff.; in K and the *Ili*, 123 f.; in  
   Α, 125; characteristic of early poetry,  
   116; and 218 ff., 225, 226 f.
- Retardation of action, 142, 178  
 Rhapsodes, their additions to the poems,  
   19, 21 f.; and 100, 122, 186 n., 210,  
   226
- Rhēsus, 2, 3, 6, 226, 15, 62, 124, 141 f.,  
   274 ff.
- Rhodian, interpolation, 161; origin of  
   K, 187 n.; epithet, 248

Riding, 180, 195, 196, 198, 237, and App. L

Saga, 9, 150, 202

*Sagenverschiebungen*, xii, 150

Sarpedon, 173, 189, 262

Sceptre, Hector's, 83; Pelopid, 201, 212

Schiller referred to, 141, 178

Scholiasts quoted or referred to, 7, 8, 22, 65, 133 and n., 134, 199, 260, 275 and n.

Scott, Sir Walter, quoted or referred to, 178, 194, 196, 228, 244

Scouts and scouting, 63 f., 184, 190, 200, 232

Scribes and their errors, 24, 25, 59 f., 67, 94, 79, 83, 95, 230, 233, 280

*Shāhnāma*, the, referred to, 142, 154, 189, 190, 196, 234, 243, 275

Shakespeare quoted or referred to, 4, 18, 178, 43, 46, 53 n., 55, 150, 154, 179, 182, 192, 203, 204, 209, 223, 228, 250

Shield, of Achilles, 55, 189; of Nestor, 144; of Aias, 189, 196, 262; of Sarpedon, 189; of Hector, 196; Mycenaean and Ionian, 191, 194 ff., 197; shields in K, 195 ff.

Sicily, xiv and n.

Silence of the poet on certain matters, 64, 182, and App. L

Similes, in K, 6, 174 f.; in B, 30; in *Il.* and *Od.*, 39, 131, 206; moods in, 91; *tertium comparationis*, 165, 184; ready-made, 174, 207; the opening simile in K, 56, 184 f., 221, 253, 261

Singularities in the poems, 50, 179, 186

Sintians, 206

Skins as dress. See Armour and dress

Snow, 184 and n., 264

Solon, xvi, 21

Sophocles quoted or referred to, 18, 19, 63, 163, 263

*Sparsamkeit* of the Epos, law of, 183

Spear, 62 f., 117, 144, 169, 193, 229 ff.

Spiritus asper, 102, 112

Stevenson, R. L., referred to, 179

Sthenelus, 145, 155

*Stümper*, the, of German criticism, 20, 31, 201, 212

Style and technique, the Homeric, simplicity of, 8; charge of want of dignity, 12; other faults, *ibid.*; in K 13, 174; variations in, 46; misappreciation of a point in, 121 f., and see Contrasts and Necessities of the moment

Subject-matter, influence of, on diction, 37, 41, 46, 55, 58, 76, 87, 130, 238, 242, 255, and App. E *passim*.

Subjective appreciation, 30, 76, 120

Synizesis, 30, 50, 67, 232 f., 235

Tamarisk, 230 f.

Telemachus, 121, 122, 156, 169, 191

Telemachy, age of, 15; perfects in, 69; Article, 86 f.; repetitions, 120; said to imitate K, 122; & in, 255

Temples, 212

Tennyson quoted or referred to, 45, 53, 55, 95, 141, 142, 165 n., 168, 175, 194, 195, 209, 243

Tests, specific linguistic, F, xx, 49, 52, Chap. XII.; iterative verbs, xxi, 50, 52, 69, 270, App. F; *dv*, xx, 52, 220, App. F; *és*, xx, 52, App. F; genitives, 51, 52, 224 f.; datives, 52, 256; perfects in *-ka*, 68 f.; *δπλα*, 51, 65; *χρώς*, 51. Tests in general, Chap. VII., 224, and see Article, Prepositions, Optatives, Contraction, Synizesis, Versification, Vocabulary, Dual, Archaising, Odysseanum

Teucer, 167, 168

Text, xix; corruption of, 18, 20, 24, 26, 53, 62; of K, 24; modernisation, 25, 50, 81, 221, 254; emendation confirmed, 26; uncertainty of, 79; archaisms, 94; the Athenians and the, 160 and n.

Theagenes, 138

Theology and Religion, cunning of the gods, 7; religion more advanced in *Od.*, 41 f.; poet pulls divine strings, 159 f.; gods in *Il.* and *Od.*, 206; scene below divine dignity, 209; archaism in religious matters, 211; war in Heaven, 212

Theomachy, opinions on, 31; language of, 48

Theophanies, 144, 169, 176, 209

Thersites, 209

Theseus, references to, 160

Thetis, 124, 182, 191, 207, 211

Thoas, 167

Thracians, slaughter of, 155 f., 159; metal work, 175

Tlepolemus episode, 182

Tmesis, 58, 72

Tracks in the camp and over the plain, 4, 230

Trades, specialisation of, in *Il.*, 42

Tradition, xiii f.

Tragedy, Attic, Article in, 88; degradation of Odysseus, 163

Tragic, element in K, 8 and n.; elevation of the Homeric poetry, 12

Transmission of the poems, xiii, 21

Trojans, attitude of poems to, 171 n.; noisiness of, 175; encamped on high ground, 181; their plans, 225 f.; hardly mentioned in the *Od.*, 248

Troy, site of, xiv; capture of, 163; plunder got in the district, 182

Tydeus, 172, 175, 176, 201

- Unebenheiten*, 171, 188, 210, 218, 220  
 Unitarian belief, xxi f., 45, 151, 172,  
 174  
*Ur-Ilias* or *Mēnis*, vicissitudes of, xi ;  
 style of, 12 ; language of, 27, 29, 48,  
 217 ; new view of, 32 ff. ; indulgence  
 towards, 49 ; Ionisms in, 52 ; Article  
 in, 85 f., 87 ; *F* in, 97 f. ; versification  
 of, 109 ; relation of *K* to, 124, 215 ;  
 infirmities of, Chap. XXV.
- Veneration for the poems, xvi, 21, 217  
 Vergil, quoted or referred to, 6, 7, 263,  
 18, 178, 53, 141, 142, 163, 191, 204,  
 244, 263 ; his imitation of the Doloneia,  
 10, 141, 156, 183, 186, 190, 203  
 Versification, Chap. XIII. ; corruption  
 of text due to supposed defects, 26 ;  
 affected by direct speech, 39 ; differ-  
 ences, 45 ; effect on language, 46 ;  
*unus color*, 48 ; dactyl preferred, 51,  
 233, 235 ; causes licence, 53 ; corre-  
 tion, 67 ; equal division of line, 69 ;  
 lengthening, 93 ; spondaic endings, 94 ;  
 of *A*, 271  
 Vocabulary, in *Il.* and *Od.* respectively,
- 36, 44, App. E ; influences modifying,  
 39, 40 ; weight of differences in, 40 ff. ;  
 of right and wrong, 41 ; abundance of,  
 58 ; our ignorance of, 53, 55 ; single  
 occurrences, 55 ; words favoured by  
*K*, 57 f. ; vocabulary of Milton, 45 f.  
*Volksgenit* and *Volksseele*, xvi
- Wall and Fosse, 2 n., 4, 38, 181  
 Warrior Vase, the, 62, 197  
 Weathering of surface of poems. See  
 Interpolation  
 Wolf, F. A., x, 21  
 Wolf, the, 191 and n.  
 Woopers, the, in the *Od.*, 8, 38, 179, 209,  
 250, 252, 265  
 Writing, xiii
- Xenophon quoted or referred to, 222, 235
- Zeugma in *A*, 208  
 Zeus, deserts Agamemnon, 2, 152, 157 ;  
 his promise to Thetis, 8 ; in *Θ*, 159 f.,  
 166 ; in *A*, 211 ; epithets, 56, 246  
 Zoilus, 187, 191

## 2. GREEK

Some words and expressions discussed or referred to.

- ἀγελεῖη, 61  
 ἀγέρωχος, 248  
 ἀδηκτές, ἀρηότες, 68  
 ἀειρω, συναειρω, 237  
 ἀηθέσσω, 64, 253  
 ἀκμή, 64  
 ἀκούω, 234  
 ἀλιος, 119  
 ἀλλ' ίομεν, 173  
 ἀμφί, 238  
 ἀνδιχα πᾶσα κεάσθη, 247  
 ἀντι καὶ τὸ φυλάσσειν, 78  
 ἀντιτορέω, 64  
 ἀντιξ, 62  
 ἀπαξ εἰρημένα, 28, 54 ff., 257, 270  
 ἀπὸ δόξης, 119  
 ἀπὸ θεον ύψοσ' αἰερπας, 229  
 (τὸ) ἀπρεπές, 7, 23  
 -ᾶς in acc. pl. of 1 decl., 52 and n.  
 ἀσάμυθος, 182  
 ἀτη, 53, 66  
 αὐτός, 50, 236 f., 271, 279 f.  
 αὐτός γάρ ἐφέλκεται ἀνδρα σιδηρος, App.  
 M
- βεβίηκεν, 68
- γάρ, 25, 26

- δαΐφρων, 248  
 δέελος, δῆλος, 50, 62, 228  
 δεικτικῶς, 83, 84  
 δεινὸν τὸ ἡρωϊκόν, 164, 275  
 δῆρις, 280  
 διὰ νύκτα, 75  
 διαπρύσιον, 38, 41  
 δουρὶ -ατι, 51
- ἔγηργηρθασι -θαι, 90, 92  
 ἔγηργορτι, 50  
 ἔθεν, ἔο, etc., 238, 239  
 (τὸ) ἔθμον τοῦ ποιητοῦ, 32  
 el-clauses, 244 f.  
 εἰσασεν, 94  
 εἰ γάρ, with opt., 126  
 εἰσθα, 66  
 ἐκδαβαλω, 234  
 ἐκτάδιος, 64  
 ἐκτὸς ἀπό, 234  
 Ἐλπετο, 6 n.  
 ἐμαυτόν, etc., 51  
 ἐμέο -έθεν, 68  
 ἐν, 74, 76  
 ἐν ἀγρομένοισιν, 234  
 ἐξ, 73 f.  
 ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ποιησέως, 18, 31  
 ἐξῆς δ' ἐξόμενοι κ.τ.λ., 38

ἐπείγεσθαι (*βιάζεσθαι*) βελέεσσι, 172  
 ἐπείγετον, 90, 91  
 ἐπ' ἥματι, 232  
 ἐπι-, 72 f., 75, 238  
 ἐπιδιφράς, 62, 278  
 ἐπίσκοπος, 232  
 ἐπιτρέπω, 54, 57  
 ἐργδουπος πόσις "Ηρης, 56  
 ἐργδουνος and ἐργδουπος, 38  
 ἐς, ἔσω, 52, App. F  
 ἐσάκουσε, 166  
 -εσι, dat. plur. in, 236  
 ἐστ' ἄν, 52  
 ἔπι, 232  
 εὐ καὶ ἐπισταμένως, 122  
 ἔνξος, 67  
 εὐτείχεον -εα, 26 n., 53 n., 110  
 ἔῶμεν, 235

*Fékaстos*, 101, 104

*Féρδω*, 104

*Fepύστω*, 105

*Fepύώ*, 103

*Fetώσтос*, 99

*Ft*, *Ft*, *Fiv*, 93

*Fωή*, 104

*Fóikos*, 97, 100

*Fóinovs*, 97, 98, 100

ȝ and ȝ interchanged, 25

ȝ, correption of, 236

ȝμέας, ȝμας, 222

-ȝμεναι, infns. in, 259

ȝμνυ, 235

-θεν, 257

θήκατο, 67

'Iás, 52

īαχε, 103

īdīa τετάχθαι, 136

īzáνу and compounds, 58

īмáнtes, 62

īna, 234

īмwорo, 168

īпpоbáтn and īпpоstróфoс, 197

īпpóмaхo, 236

īпpѡn ȳpebήseto, 275 ff.

īрbн, ȳepá, 57

кaгжaлбѡn, 200

каl γáp tis te, 172

каl мuн фwнжaсa к.т.λ., 50

каlóс, 52, 252

кataбжomeн, 181

катаbжomеn, constructions, 223

кат' oбtaмeнn ȳteиlhн, 172

кhдeи moxжhseиn kaл pлeioсiн, 157

kráteсphi, 90, 92 f.

кунтatov, 156

λάξ πoδi κiνήσaс, 116

λη̄tis, 61

λiсseсthai, 67, 69

μáн, μήn, 245

μeтhмeн, 236

μeлlω, 67, 69

μeн oñu, 245

μeо 68

μeтá, 74, 76

μeтáphrenoн eύpн káluψe, 173

μeн oñu, 70

μeгhseсthai, 66

μoхthéw, -iw, 233

Naпstаthmос, 4, 29

neгhluðes, 58

nekroñ áмbañvontes, 26

nuñ, 83, 233

ȝupðn, 42, 64

Oltos 'Ilou, 15

oñu, 233

ðeñu ȳkonta, 229, 266

ðmiloп, 23, 265

ð, ðti, ós, óñeka, 240 f.

ðtla, 27, 51, 54, 65

ðt' ãn, 221

oñð' álaoskopiuñ eñx', 122, 202

oñðen, 70

ðféllow, 280

пáн ȳkonoп daimoniaw, 160

пaрá, 73

пaрaфthalpти, 90 f., 96

пaрaвhакeв, 68

пeрl, 75, 239

пeukedanb, 65, 247

пiпtбntwa, 234

пiфaнcka, 58, 236

пiéaw, 224

пoikilos, 176 f., 260

пoлuтlжmuѡn, 167

(тð) pрépon, 17

пró, 75

пoтápoиthe, 65

пrotol, 73

þeхhтeñ ðe te uñpios ȳgnw, 204

saunrwtñp, 62, 117

сhмa, -ata, 229 n.

сliga, 172

сiвpтhos, 275 ff.

сkопiáжa, dia-, 64

сkопðb, 63, 119, 232

Сmuñtheñs, 182, 211

spéno, 90, 93

stðma pðlémou, 65

suлáw, 235

suнаaelrѡ, 237, 275

sfísuñ, 90, 91, 225

ταλασί·, ταλάφρων, 167  
 τάων, τῶν, 224  
 τιθήμενος, 90, 94, 259  
 τίθημι, 67  
 τις, omission of, 262  
 τλήμων, 167 f.  
 τοῖσδεσσι, 66  
 τό, τὸ . δ, 239 f.  
 τὼ δέ οἱ ὄμως, 85

ὑβρις, 152, 250  
 ὑπό, 73  
 ὑψόθε' ἔσντι Διι, 54

φαίης κε, 243  
 φασὶ δὲ οἱ παλαιοὶ, Chap. XVI.  
 φῆμις, 28, 58, 251, 264  
 φθάνω, 52, 91

φθάνω, ἐπεύχομαι and βάλλω in combination, 174  
 φθέγγομαι, 58, 119  
 -φ, 92 f.  
 φιν, 93  
 φόβος, 23, 63  
 φυγή, -αδε, 63  
 φύξις, 58, 63

χειρὶ παχείη, 119  
 χειρὶ, χερὶ, 51  
 χλαῖνα, 64  
 χρασμεῖν, 247  
 χρήματα, κτήματα, 251  
 χρώς, 51

ῶδε δέ τις εἴπεσκε κ.τ.λ., 50  
 ὡς εἰπὼν ὥτρυνε κ.τ.λ., 38

## 3. SOME PASSAGES DISCUSSED

K, <i>passim</i>	PAGE	PAGE	PAGE	PAGE
1-4.	121	251	137	A
5 ff.	184 f., 221	252 f.	223 f.	32 ff.
15 ff.	153 f.	265 .	122	213
19 f.	9, 153	278 ff.	118, 172 f.	240 ff.
26 ff.	116	280 .	69	B 1 f..
43 f.	9, 69, 153	290 ff.	118, 225	55 .
45	124	302 .	124	217 .
47 ff.	158	309 ff.	225	362 ff.
51 ff.	221	314 ff.	158 f.	653 ff.
57 ff.	153, 221	324 .	119	Δ 339
67 ff.	153	335 .	6 n.	356 .
68 .	124	336 f.	158	370 ff.
77 ff.	194	344 .	69	E
84 .	221	351-3	119	Z 227 f.
89 f.	124	365 f.	123	Θ
93 ff.	153 f.	387 ff.	225	. 15, 33, 129,
97 ff.	116	396 ff.	225	131, 139, 149,
104 ff.	145	400 .	122 f.	165
105 ff.	25, 157	401 ff.	122 f.	141, 159 f.
111 .	124	409 ff.	123	92 ff.
146 f.	222	439 f.	124	I .
152 .	196 f.	448 .	225	. 15, 129, 139,
157 ff.	116 f.	453 .	69	147f., 149, 154,
176 .	155	454 ff.	119	207, 208
202 .	222	465 ff.	34 ff.	146
208 ff.	225 f.	482 ff.	App. B	124
211 f.	122, 222 f.	493 .	609 f.	157
213 ff.	185 f.	496 f.	119 f.	26
214 f.	117	499 .	654 f.	310 ff.
219 .	155	513 .	226	. 145
228 ff.	223	515 .	275	401 ff.
234 ff.	155	527 .	44 ff.	. 165 f.
237 ff.	223	530 f.	226	112 .
240 .	158	533 ff.	120, 227	P 75 ff.
242 ff.	69, 117 f.	540 .	120	546 .
		566 ff.	227	Σ 82 f.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
X 206 f.	123	$\theta$ 124	. . .	119	$\tau$ 13 . . .
414 f.	124	$\lambda$ 344	. . .	119	130 ff. . . .
$\Omega$ . . .	207, 208	$\mu$ 281 f.	. . .	116	$v$ 52 . . . .
74 . . .	124	$\nu$ 299 ff.	. . .	118	161 . . . .
677 ff.	121	$\xi$ 457 ff.	. . .	127	$\chi$ 307 ff. . . .
$\alpha$ 64 ff.	117 f.	$\circ$ 4 ff.	. . .	121 f.	326 ff. . . .
245 ff.	117	44 ff.	. . .	116 f.	371 . . . .
$\gamma$ 382 ff.	118	$\pi$ 122 f.	. . .	117	461 ff. . . .
$\delta$ 145 f.	116	296 . . .	App. M	$\psi$ 318 f.	41, 156
					146

THE END

# WORKS ON GREEK LITERATURE

PAUSANIAS'S DESCRIPTION OF GREECE. Translated by J. G. FRAZER, Litt.D. With Commentary, Illustrations, and Maps. Six vols. 8vo. 126s. net.

PAUSANIAS AND OTHER GREEK SKETCHES. By J. G. FRAZER, Litt.D. Globe 8vo. 4s. net.

GROWTH AND INFLUENCE OF CLASSICAL GREEK POETRY. By Sir R. C. JEBB, Litt.D. Crown 8vo. 7s. net.

A HISTORY OF CLASSICAL GREEK LITERATURE. By the Rev. J. P. MAHAFFY, M.A., D.D. Two vols. Crown 8vo. Vol. I. The Poets. With an Appendix on Homer by Prof. SAYCE. In two parts. Vol. II. The Prose Writers. In two parts. 4s. 6d. each part.

ABRIDGED HISTORY OF GREEK LITERATURE. By MM. ALFRED and MAURICE CROISSET. Translated by G. F. HEFFELBOWER. 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

LECTURES ON THE REPUBLIC OF PLATO. By R. L. NETTLESHIP. Edited by G. R. BENSON. 8vo. 8s. 6d. net.

ARISTOTLE ON THE ART OF POETRY. A Lecture by A. O. PRICKARD, Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

ESSAYS ON GREEK LITERATURE. By R. Y. TYRRELL, Litt.D. Crown 8vo. 4s. net.

EURIPIDES AND THE SPIRIT OF HIS DRAMAS. By Prof. PAUL DECHARME. Translated by JAMES LOEB, A.B. 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.

# WORKS ON GREEK LITERATURE

THE ILIAD OF HOMER. By WALTER LEAF, Litt.D.  
Second Edition. 8vo. Vol. I. (Books I.-XII.). Vol. II.  
(Books XIII.-XXIV.). 15s. net each.

COMPANION TO THE ILIAD FOR ENGLISH  
READERS. By WALTER LEAF, Litt.D. Crown 8vo.  
7s. 6d.

THE ILIAD OF HOMER. Translated into English Prose  
by ANDREW LANG, M.A., WALTER LEAF, Litt.D., and  
ERNEST MYERS, M.A. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

THE ODYSSEY OF HOMER. Done into English by  
S. H. BUTCHER, Litt.D., and ANDREW LANG, M.A.  
Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

THE HOMERIC HYMNS. Edited with notes and appen-  
dices by T. W. ALLEN, M.A., and E. E. SIKES, M.A.  
8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE GREEK GENIUS. By S. H.  
BUTCHER, Litt.D. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. net.

HARVARD LECTURES ON THE ORIGINALITY OF  
GREECE. By S. H. BUTCHER, Litt.D. Crown 8vo.  
7s. net.

THE ANCIENT GREEK HISTORIANS. (Harvard  
Lectures.) By Prof. J. B. BURY, Litt.D. 8vo. 7s. 6d.  
net.

ARISTOPHANES AND THE POLITICAL PARTIES  
AT ATHENS. By MAURICE CROISSET. Translated  
by JAMES LOEB. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

LECTURES ON CLASSICAL SUBJECTS. By Prof.  
W. R. HARDIE, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. net.

---

LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.



49343

University of California  
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY  
Return this material to the library  
from which it was borrowed.

DRION

REC'D LU-URC

W  
ERL

SEP 04 1990

AUG 25 1990

01/11

APR 01 1992

APR 03 1992

01 JAN 23 1998

APR MAY 02 2005

MAY 02 2005

10,-

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 825 342 9

